DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 270 365 SO 017 188

AUTHOR	Cornbleth, Catherine, Ed.
TITLE	An Invitation to Research in Social Education. Bulletin No. 77.
INSTITUTION	National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-87986-51-0
PUB DATE	86
NOTE	145p.; For related documents, see ED 254 477 and ED 255 469.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Council for the Social Studies, 3501 Newark Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20016.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Early Childhood Education; *Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnography; Experiments; Models; Questionnaires; Research; Researchers; *Social Studies; Teachers

ABSTRACT

Nine authors contributed to a three part bulletin inviting research in social education. Part 1, Research Perspectives, contains chapters one and two: (1) "The Invitation" (Catherine Cornbleth) and (2)"Paradigm and Purpose" (Thomas S. Popkewitz). Part 2, "Research Alternatives, has chapters three through eight: (3) "Survey Research" (Dennie L. Smith); (4) "Experimental Research" (Patrick Ferguson); (5) "An Ethnographic Approach" (Jane J. White); (6) "Critical Research" (William B. Stanley); (7) "Social Education of Young Children" (Marianne N. Block); and (8) "Social Studies Teachers as Researchers" (Judith Torney-Purta). Part 3, Two Views of Social Studies Research, includes the final chapters nine and ten; (9) "A Teacher's Perspective" (Saundra J. McKee) and (10) "Social Studies Research Reconsidered" (Catherine Cornbleth). Each of the chapters has an accompanying bibliography. (JH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED270365

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

An Invitation to Research in Social Education

Bulletin No. 77

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
National Council for the Social Studies
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO017198

Catherine Cornbleth · Editor

An Invitation to Research in Social Education

◆ ◆ ◆

Catherine Cornbleth
Editor

National Council for the Social Studies
Bulletin No. 77
ISBN 0-87986-051-0

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE SOCIAL STUDIES

President
Paul R. Shires
Glendale Nicolet High School
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
President-Elect
Jan L. Tucker
Florida International University
Miami, Florida
Vice President
Donald Schneider
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia
Executive Director
Frances Haley
Washington, DC
Director of Publications
Charles R. Rivera
Washington, DC

Board of Directors
Virginia A. Atwood
Linda Biemer
Donald H. Bragaw
Jean Craven
Lois W. Daniel
Betty S. Dean
Robert Dilzer, Jr.
Judy Finkelstein
Shirley J. Johnson
Dick Kraft
Bob Lynch
William J. Marks
Mary McFarland
Debra J. Miller
Helen W. Richardson
Bob Stahl
Karen R. Todorov
Ex Officio
Margit McGuire

Publications Committee
David Naylor, Chairperson
Margaret Carter
Matthew T. Downey
Denny Schillings
Ann Stoddard
William W. Wilen
Linda S. Wojtan
Ex Officio
Frances Haley
Tedd Levy, Chair, *Social Education* Editorial Committee
Charles R. Rivera
Donald Schneider, Vice President

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 86-070312
ISBN 0-87986-51-0
Copyright © 1986 by the
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE SOCIAL STUDIES
3501 Newark Street N.W., Washington, DC 20016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTRIBUTORS iv

PART I Research Perspectives

Chapter 1: THE INVITATION 1
Catherine Cornbleth

Chapter 2: PARADIGM AND PURPOSE 10
Thomas S. Popkewitz

PART II Research Alternatives

Chapter 3: SURVEY RESEARCH 28
Dennie L. Smith

Chapter 4: EXPERIMENTAL RESEARCH 40
Patrick Ferguson

Chapter 5: AN ETHNOGRAPHIC APPROACH 51
Jane J. White

Chapter 6: CRITICAL RESEARCH 78
William B. Stanley

Chapter 7: SOCIAL EDUCATION OF YOUNG CHILDREN 91
Marianne N. Bloch

Chapter 8: SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS AS RESEARCHERS 109
Judith Torney-Purta

PART III Two Views of Social Studies Research

Chapter 9: A TEACHER'S PERSPECTIVE 119
Saundra J. McKee

Chapter 10: SOCIAL STUDIES RESEARCH RECONSIDERED 127
Catherine Cornbleth

INDEX 138

CONTRIBUTORS

Marianne N. Bloch is Assistant Professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Her field of specialization is early childhood education, and she is particularly interested in cultural and historical studies in children's socialization. She has also done cross-cultural studies in French-speaking Africa.

Catherine Cornbleth is Associate Professor of Education, University of Pittsburgh. A former secondary social studies teacher, she now coordinates social studies education programs at Pitt and has been actively engaged in social studies curriculum and classroom research.

Patrick Ferguson is Professor of Education, the University of Alabama. A former junior and senior high school social studies teacher, he currently teaches social studies methods, curriculum and research at the University of Alabama.

Saundra J. McKee teaches social studies at Shannock Valley High School in Rural Valley, Pennsylvania. She has also written text materials in United States history and government. Currently, she is a doctoral candidate in secondary education at the University of Pittsburgh.

Thomas S. Popkewitz is Professor of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. A former elementary school teacher, he has long been interested in ways of improving schools and ways in which research can inform such efforts.

Dennie L. Smith is Associate Professor of Education at Memphis State University and teaches graduate courses in social studies education and instructional design. He also coordinates an alternative teacher preparation and certification program for academically talented liberal arts graduates.

William B. Stanley is Associate Professor of Education, Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge. A former social studies teacher, he is now involved in social studies foundations and concept formation research.

Judith Torney-Purta is Professor of Human Development, University of Maryland at College Park. In 1977 she won the Citation for Exemplary Research from the National Council for the Social Studies. She has been working with groups of teachers doing research in their own classrooms in Missouri and Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

Jane J. White is Assistant Professor and elementary education coordinator at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County. A former elementary teacher whose graduate studies were in anthropology, she is currently conducting ethnographic research on cultural transmission in the classroom and teaching social studies methods and field research courses.

NCSS Publications Staff for *An Invitation to Research in Social Education*
Charles R. Rivera, *Editor and Director of Publications*
Anne Janney, *Associate Editor*
Mary Pat Doherty, *Art Director*
Leah Cohen, *Production Artist*
Mildred Edwards, *Indexer, Proofreader*
Margaret Cromartie, *Publications Assistant*

CHAPTER 1

THE INVITATION

Catherine Cornbleth

What do we mean by research? Simply put, research means looking carefully at something or looking at something in a different way in order to describe and explain it. In the context of science and scholarship, that "looking" is of a particular kind. It is the purposeful and systematic investigation of ideas, objects, situations or other phenomena. We might, for example, raise and pursue questions about why many schools and social studies teachers resist change, or about how exceptional teachers surmount the myriad demands and frustrations of classroom teaching. In simplest terms, *research is systematic inquiry.* Research in social studies education draws on and overlaps social science and education research.

In the course of talking about social studies research, we provide and comment on *examples* of that research, suggest practical *implications,* and offer *guidance for using and doing* research. Examples have been selected to highlight certain features of social studies research. Implications are suggested not only for classroom practice, but also for the practice of social studies curriculum design and teacher education. Guidance is offered, but no quick-and-easy recipes are possible.

In some ways, our research is as diverse as our school programs and classroom practices. Our intent is to introduce the multiple perspectives and practices of social studies research. In so doing, we hope to

- Inform, by providing information about different kinds of research and illustrations from actual studies
- Enable the thoughtful reading, using and doing of research
- Arouse interest in the potential of social studies research and an awareness of its richness and weaknesses, its possibilities and limitations
- Provoke critical thought about the nature and purposes of social studies research and education.

We have attempted to pursue these rather ambitious goals in a manner that is scholarly and serious, but not somber, pompous or otherwise forbidding. We hope to invite your further participation in the excitement, frustration and promise of research.

PASSION AND RESEARCH[1]

Before turning to accounts of particular forms and examples of social studies research, I want to present a case for passion in social studies research. We often hear calls for more research, sometimes accompanied by laundry lists of "needed" research studies. Instead, I suggest that social studies education would benefit from more passion. "Passion?" you ask. "Isn't research supposed to be dispassionate?" Well, perhaps it is, according to some authors of research texts and instructors of research courses. But, according to others, it cannot and should not be. And, in practice, research is certainly not dispassionate.

Borrowing freely from Michael Polyani's 1957 paper in the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists,* "Passion and Controversy in Science," I am suggesting that passion is a crucial feature of meaningful educational research and that the functions served by intellectual-scientific passion merit serious consideration and encouragement within the social studies education community. Although Polyani's frame of reference is natural science along with its followers, his arguments are equally appropriate to social science and educational research.

First some definitions are in order. Passion is not synonymous with lust, an overwhelming urge to satisfy personal desires. Passion, which is more encompassing and less selfish, is an intense purposeful emotion of eagerness in pursuit of significant goals. It is also disciplined, in part by the communities to which we belong, to respond to challenges to our cherished values and to pursue our visions of the desirable future (see Popkewitz 1978; Sampson 1978). Thus, passion is social, not solely personal, in character, and it moves us to act in particular ways. In the context of research, passion is evident in the enthusiastic pursuit of meaningful knowledge—for example, about how and why social studies curriculum favors some interests and groups over others—which differs from mere accumulation of data—for example about course offerings and graduation requirements.

The functions or types of intellectual-scientific passion distinguished by Polyani are the selective, the heuristic and the persuasive. Selective passion moves us to raise questions that are worth pursuing. Granted, we may disagree on the criteria of value, which anticipates persuasive passion. Heuristic passion prompts us to create the means to answer our questions when conventional procedures are inadequate or inappropriate. Persuasive passion impels us to defend and convince others of the merit of our questions, methods and findings.

Selective Passion and Value

Selective passion motivates us to respond to the question "What is worth knowing?" It involves recognition and rejection of what is "manifestly trivial" as well as what is "manifestly false." The accuracy of an observation, Polyani notes, "does not in itself make it valuable" (1957, p. 115). The value of an observation or finding is based less on its origins than on its implications, its power to alter our conceptions and expand our perspectives, thus promising greater understanding of experience and its possibilities. (On this point, see also Bellack 1981; Magoon 1977.)

Selective passion enables us to resist what Kaplan calls the "myth of methodology," the mistaken assumption that our major research challenges are technical and that if we can only improve our research procedures, progress is certain (1964, p. 24). The argument is, simply, that questions of what is worth knowing should take precedence over and influence our responses to procedural questions.

By way of analogy, consider that just as sophisticated sex is not synonymous with loving, the procedurally precise study is not necessarily meaningful research. Curiously, there appear to be striking similarities between some educational research texts and sex manuals, insofar as they are how-to-do-it guides preoccupied with technique. If there is to be salvation through educational research, it is unlikely to be encountered along the route of technical preoccupation. Visions of an objective, technically pure educational science are at best misleading. Their pursuit is apt to be fruitless and frustrating. Among other things, a technical view loses sight of the fact that research procedures and instruments are human inventions. As human inventions, they cannot be objective in the conventional sense of "revealing truth" or providing direct access to "reality."

Selective passion can help us avoid the trivial and nonsensical. According to Polyani:

> Any process of inquiry unguided by intellectual passions would inevitably spread out into a desert of trivialities. Our vision of reality . . . must suggest to us the kind of questions that it should be reasonable and interesting to explore. They should recommend the kind of conceptions and empirical relations that are intrinsically plausible and which should therefore be upheld—even when some evidence seems to contradict them; and tell us also, on the other hand, what empirical connections to reject as specious, even though there is evidence for them, and even though we may as yet be unable to account for this evidence on any other assumptions. This is the *selective* function of scientific passion. (1957, p. 115)

Selective passion, like other forms, is not merely a matter of personal whim or intuition. Our passions, as our knowledge and beliefs, are socially constructed. That is, they are created by individuals within a social milieu or community. That commodity both reflects and shapes the knowledge, beliefs, passions and inquiries of its members. The communal base of passion and inquiry provides support for our efforts and makes them seem reasonable. Sometimes we become so comfortable in familiar surroundings that we take our ways of thinking and acting for granted, be they ways of teaching, doing research or socializing with friends. But, as we shall see, there are multiple research communities and what is reasonable to one may be most unreasonable to another.

Encouraging rather than stifling selective passion in social studies education research could promote the questioning of taken-for-granted assumptions and hand-me-down practices. It might lead to different purposes and kinds of research. We might consider, for example, that our research can inform social studies classroom practice by suggesting alternative perspectives and possibilities, but that it cannot, and should not be expected to, prescribe what ought to be or what will "work." We might then pursue studies that describe and explain ongoing social studies classroom activity as well as studies that monitor particular change efforts or that attempt to demonstrate the superiority of one product or practice compared to another. We might also examine "effects" in terms broader and longer range than unit or year-end achievement scores. Selective passion is reflected in our raising and responding to questions of significance and value. It moves us to resist doing research simply because an opportunity arises to collect data or because someone else, such as a funding agency, is interested in the answer to a question.

Heuristic Passion and Originality

The selective function of passion blends with its heuristic function as our visions foreshadow specific discoveries and "sustain their persistent pursuit." "The appreciation of scientific value merges here," according to Polyani, "into the capacity for discovering it" (1957, p. 115). Ideas unaccompanied by possibilities for inquiry remain unfulfilled. In addition, scientific as opposed to technological research does not necessarily follow conventional pathways. Polyani, among others, has observed that

> discovery is creative also in the sense that it is not to be achieved by the diligent application of any previously known and specifiable procedure. It requires originality. . . . Originality must be passionate. (1957, p. 116)

It is heuristic passion that sustains and guides creative scientific inquiry.

Heuristic passion entails both the willingness to pursue an informed hunch and the capacity to select or invent appropriate means of pursuit. To bind ourselves to known paths is to reduce science to technology. Unnecessary reliance on a narrow range of conventional procedures and measures in social studies research has limited the questions addressed, their conceptualization, and the value of the resulting studies. To what extent, for example, might "objective" observation and recording of the classroom behavior of teachers and students also be "mindless" observation that distorts and misleads understanding of practice? We ought to be selective enough to eschew those techniques that preclude our learning more about what we seek to know (see Bellack 1981).

Earlier I suggested that our research is as diverse as our school programs and classroom practices. It might be well argued that this is not much diversity, that there are variations on a theme or two, but few substantive differences among our research or classroom practices. For example, teachers use different textbooks, but still tend to rely on a single text as the mainstay of classroom instruction. Researchers use different instruments, but still tend to rely on quantitative measures and statistical analyses. Selective and heuristic passions imply consideration of alternatives, not more of the same.

Persuasive Passion and Controversy

The persuasive function of passion follows from its selective and heuristic functions. Selective and heuristic passions are apt to generate new or different data and interpretations. These alternative ways of reasoning and new visions of reality and possibility challenge prevailing belief and practice. They tend to be resisted by those who hold to the conventional wisdom. Challenge and resistance create a tension and, sometimes, overt controversy as each side attempts to convert the other(s) to its way of thinking. Just as the continuing debates over United States defense and foreign policies reflect different worldviews or paradigms, so do those within the social sciences and education. Debates between behavioral and cognitive psychologists are illustrative as are those within sociology, history, curriculum and educational research. (See Thomas S. Popkewitz' "Paradigm and Purpose," Chapter 2, for a discussion of three paradigms in educational and social studies research and their implications.)

It is difficult to persuade others to consider, let alone to accept, different ideas about research or the findings of such research. Part of the difficulty arises from differences in language and operating assumptions, not unlike those encountered in cross-cultural communication efforts. Seemingly similar words or actions may have different meanings in the two cultures, or there may be no equivalent in one culture for the words and actions of the other. Polyani observes that

> To the extent to which it [e.g., a new idea, interpretation] represents a new way of reasoning, we cannot convince others of it by formal argument, for so long as we argue within their framework, we can never induce them to abandon it. (1957, p. 116)

Quite often it is the framework or paradigm[2] itself that is at issue.

When there is no common framework enabling impersonal argument, Polyani finds personal attack unavoidable as each side attempts to discredit and then convert the other(s). Conversion requires demonstration and "persuasion which can induce a conversion," making the "opponent's way of arguing . . . appear altogether unreasonable" (1957, p. 116). An example in a social studies context is the exchange between McNeil (1981a, 1981b) and Giroux (1980, 1981) regarding the possibility of teachers taking the initiative to reform social studies education. Their exchange also pits specific empirical data against broader theory. Conceivably, a third position could be found to reconcile at least parts of the two opposing or mutually exclusive views. However, this rarely happens in time to head off vicious attack and counterattack in which the substantive issues may be obscured rather than illuminated.[3]

Polyani finds this situation "tragically inevitable," a price to be paid for the benefits of science with its selective and heuristic passions. He concludes that

> intellectual passions have an affirmative content; they affirm the scientific value of certain facts. This selective function is closely linked to their heuristic function, which links our appreciation of scientific value to a vision of reality. Heuristic passion is also the mainspring of originality. Finally, heuristic passion must often turn into persuasive passion, the mainspring of controversy. (1957, p. 119)

Passion, then, is not only present, but is an indispensable element of science and educational research.

Some Implications

To encourage selective, heuristic and persuasive passion is, of course, risky business. By challenging conventional modes of research, we risk being challenged for nonconformity to established expectations. Selective, heuristic, and persuasive passion can, however, generate constructive tensions between established and alternative views to the extent that they prompt us to examine our assumptions, values, purposes and procedures.

My intent has been to argue, I hope with passion and credibility, that to advocate more research in social studies education, or more technically rigorous research, offers false promise. Desirable, needed research in social studies education is the kind that helps us create meaningful knowledge (i.e., knowledge that facilitates understanding of social studies curriculum stability and change) and attainment of significant theoretical and practical goals. Too much of the educational and social studies research has not been very helpful to classroom teachers or anyone else. By and large, teachers have been justified in rejecting individual studies or research in general as trivial or ecologically invalid. But that situation may be changing. Relatively recent events in our research suggest promising new directions, some of which are explored in the chapters that follow. To recognize what is promising and pursue it, we need to be both informed and passionate.

OVERVIEW

While the authors of this bulletin have been asked to address certain themes and questions, no attempt has been made to obtain uniformity of tone or orientation. The diversity of substance and style aptly reflects our field, and promises greater vitality than would imposed conformity. While there is a plan to the sequence of the chapters, individual chapters make sense by themselves. So, follow our itinerary—or sample as suits your preference.

This bulletin is composed of four parts. In Part I, "Paradigm and Purpose," Thomas S. Popkewitz introduces us to the culture of educational research and to different research paradigms. He invites us on a journey that extends beyond understanding the nature of those paradigms to considering their historical setting and social purpose. What assumptions underlie research in social studies education? What are the social and political as well as the classroom implications of the research we do? Why is our research this way? What differences does it make for students, teachers, schooling and society at large?

In Part II, "Alternatives," each of six educator-researchers describes, illustrates, and comments on a particular approach to social studies research. Each one also addresses the questions of passion, paradigm and purpose introduced in Part I and suggests possibilities for teacher and classroom use.

First, Dennie L. Smith describes and comments on survey research, drawing on his own study of student perceptions of school life to illustrate the problems and possibilities of survey research. Patrick Ferguson presents the nature and standards of experimental research by comparing laboratory and classroom procedures. His illustrations are drawn from "toxygon" and "jigsaw" interdependent learning group experiments. Jane J. White immerses us in ethnographic research using transcripts and interpretations from her own studies of social studies classrooms to illustrate key features of ethnography. William B. Stanley then introduces us to critical research and its implications for social studies research and practice. His illustrations encompass historical and textbook analyses as well as classroom studies. Different passions, paradigms and purposes more or less explicitly underlie each of these approaches to research in social studies education and their presentation here.

The chapters by Marianne N. Bloch and Judith Torney-Purta cut across the kinds of research presented by Smith, Ferguson, White and Stanley. Bloch analyzes the form and substance of research into the social education of young children, with particular attention to the apparent purposes and implications of both early childhood education and research on its behalf. Torney-Purta examines and advocates the potential of social studies teachers as researchers, pointing to promising action research projects in the United States and elsewhere.

In Part III, "A Teacher's Perspective," Saundra J. McKee offers a personal account of experience with social studies research. She reflects on the frustrations and satisfactions of her involvement with social studies research as a high school social studies teacher-researcher and doctoral student.

In Part IV, "Social Studies Research Reconsidered," I return to the questions of paradigm and purpose raised in Part I in relation to the ideas and examples presented in Parts II and III. I also explore what different kinds of research might contribute to social studies education.

As this brief overview indicates, we do not intend to argue for or against a particular set of procedures for social studies research. To advocate one approach at the expense of others misses the point. It assumes a right answer regardless of the question. If you are searching for simplicity, certainty or universals, you will be disappointed. As McKee notes here, research is messy. And, as Popkewitz (1979) has observed, those who offer us paths to salvation do not tell us of whose heaven or whose hell we are to bear witness.

NOTES

[1] An earlier version of the ideas offered here was presented in a symposium on social studies research at the 1980 annual meeting of the College and University Faculty Assembly, National Council for the Social Studies, in New Orleans. I appreciate the help of Thomas S. Popkewitz and Pamela Moss in developing and refining my argument.

[2] A paradigm is a worldview or framework of knowledge and belief through which we "see" and investigate the world. Research paradigms refer to working assumptions about the world and how it is to be studied, understood and acted upon—that is, interrelated concepts and values, questions, procedures and actions. Commitment to a particular research paradigm involves affiliation with a community of scholars who mutually share, sustain, and shape the paradigm.

[3] A current illustration is the debate surrounding historian David Abraham's book on post-World War I Germany (see Bowen 1985).

REFERENCES

Bellack, Arno A. "Contrasting Approaches to Research on Teaching." In *Studying Teaching and Learning: Trends in Soviet and American Research,* edited by B. R. Tabachnick, T. S. Popkewitz, and B. B. Szekely, 59–75. New York: Praeger, 1981.

Bowen, Ezra. "Stormy Weather in Academe." *Time,* 125 (January 4, 1985): 59.

Giroux, Henry. "Critical Theory and Rationality in Citizenship Education." *Curriculum Inquiry,* 10 (Winter 1980): 329–366.

Giroux, Henry. "Pedagogy, Pessimism, and the Politics of Conformity: A Reply to Linda McNeil." *Curriculum Inquiry,* 11 (Fall 1981): 211–222.

Kaplan, Abraham. *The Conduct of Inquiry.* New York: Chandler, 1964.

Magoon, A. Jon. "Constructivist Approaches in Educational Research." *Review of Educational Research,* 47 (Fall 1977): 651–693.

McNeil, Linda M. "On the Possibility of Teachers as the Source of an Emancipatory Pedagogy: A Response to Henry Giroux." *Curriculum Inquiry,* 11 (Fall 1986a) 205–210.

McNeil, Linda M. "Response to Henry Giroux's 'Pedagogy, pessimism, and the Politics of Conformity.' " *Curriculum Inquiry,* 11 (Winter 1981b): 393–394.

Polyani, Michael. "Passion and Controversy in Science." *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists,* 13 (April 1957): 114–119.

Popkewitz, Thomas S. "Educational Research: Values and Visions of Social Order." *Theory and Research in Social Education,* 6 (December 1978): 20–39.

Popkewitz, Thomas S. "Whose Heaven and Whose Hell? The Professionalization of Educational Change." Unpublished manuscript, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1979.

Sampson, Edward E. "Scientific Paradigms and Social Values: Wanted—A Scientific Revolution." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 36 (1978): 1332–1343.

CHAPTER 2

PARADIGM AND PURPOSE

Thomas S. Popkewitz

Science seems a clear occupational activity. Science, the historian Collinwood once said, is asking questions and finding answers. More inclined to statistic rigor, the educational psychologist Suppes said that we do not need wisdom in education but the systematic knowledge that science can give us.

Yet, what we do as researchers is not free from our personal, social and cultural situation. The questions and findings of an educational research community are embedded in its larger social and cultural milieu. Research is influenced by the values, beliefs and political agendas that have developed historically. It should be no wonder to anyone familiar with the cultural and economic history of the United States to understand that our research is dominated by presuppositions that glorify an individualism existing within an emergent corporate structure. While this gets ahead of the story, it begins to focus the questions of this essay: What styles of social studies research are practiced? In pursuing this question, three styles of research or paradigms are identified. The concern about styles of research poses two further questions: Why are these styles of research plausible in the United States rather than other ways of asking questions and seeking answers? And, what are the implications of these styles of research for establishing the meaning and purposes of schooling? Science is not an isolated activity, but one that reflects and influences definitions of purpose in society.

THE CULTURE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH: SCIENCE AS LANGUAGE AND SOCIAL VISIONS[1]

We can consider social science as a way of thinking or reasoning about the world and its possibilities. As a way of thinking, social science provides us with a particular language to categorize, define and impute value to the various elements of our personal, social and political life. As with all linguistic structures, science contains sets of assumptions about the world and the "nature" of things that we wish to explore. The words of research enable us to emphasize certain objects, processes and qualities, saying, "notice this" or "these things belong together." The words do not mirror realities, but allow us to suppose that the world is "this way" or "that way." We can talk about "ego," political ideology or teacher "burn-out" and use these concepts to influence what we do. In offering these words to interpret our human conditions, however, we should recognize that they are words invented as heuristic devices for inquiry.

The assumptions of the language of social science can be considered through the historian's notion of "climate of opinion." Each age has preconceptions about what the world is like. These assumptions may be that society is highly integrated and cohesive or loosely stranded, or that people are rational or irrational. The concept of climate of opinion provides a way of talking about a particular use of intelligence or type of logic employed to understand human activity (Becker 1932; see also Foucault 1970).

Medieval European thought, as exemplified in the writing of St. Augustine, posited that existence is a cosmic drama written by God according to a central theme and rational plan. People are to accept this plan as written and as interpreted by the sacerdotalists. The function of intelligence is to reconcile experience with the pattern determined by God rather than to inquire into the origin of existence.

Contemporary U.S. educational theory, in contrast, defines the function of intelligence differently. Individualism is the major theme, reflecting the sanctity of the individual and the responsibility of the individual for obtaining personal happiness and social achievement. Knowledge is seen as socially constructed through people's interactions with each other, and individuals are major agents in creating, sustaining and renewing their social conditions.

The meaning of "individualization" in schooling responds to a variety of deeply held social and cultural beliefs. Many of these beliefs emerge from the 17th century liberal thought, like that articulated by the political philosopher, John Locke. For Locke, the individual is an essentially receptive, reflective organism whose qualities are shaped over time by the environment. Consciousness is formed as an individual thinks and reasons about the existing world of objects. These beliefs about individualism were part of an emerging social and economic situation in which a bourgeoisie was assuming importance in England, and the authority of the aristocracy and church was declining. The 17th century notions of individualism are part of current pedagogical theories, modified as cultural and social circumstances have changed (see Popkewitz 1983).

The assumptions of the climate of opinion are so deeply rooted in social research that they are rarely questioned. Individualism is a part of the taken-for-granted world of our schooling and culture. Our behavioral sciences, our methods of designing curriculum, and our taxonomies of thought and cognition maintain these assumptions. Bloom's taxonomies of cognition, management systems of instruction, and the definitions of problem solving in curriculum derive, in the main, from the incorporation of English philosophy and political theory into the U.S. historical situation.

The idea of a climate of opinion leads us to consider the idea of rationality itself. Very often, our contemporary world calls forth the belief that people should be rational about their decisions and actions. The idea of "being rational" assumes that there is one way in which people can effectively and efficiently consider problems. A rational-management approach to curriculum design, for example, defines tasks as logically discrete, sequential and hierarchical. Some behavioral scientists have stated that science is approaching human behavior in an administratively efficient manner. If we compare the world of Thomas Aquinas to that of John Locke or our contemporary conditions, we realize that there are a variety of ways by which one has been and can be rational. Rationality is varied and involves different forms of reasoning about our social affairs.

Our definition of rationality assumes further meaning within Western and, in particular, capitalistic nations. The intellectual in Western nations emerged in an economic and cultural milieu that emphasized the individual in competition with others. Economically, this involved the development of the "market" place for material products. It also involved the location of intellectuals in what is metaphorically called "the market place of ideas." Unattached to the state, in contrast to the situation in Eastern Europe, the Western European and U.S. intellectual participated in a structure that supported conflict and competition. This competition was given further legitimation by the pluralistic, ethnic composition of United States society—as there are multiple traditions, customs and patterns of culture, so are there multiple intellectual traditions. The work of historians, sociologists and philosophers of science gives credence to the importance of varied paradigms in the development and growth of science.

The ideas of climate of opinion and plural rationalities provide a perspective to research in U.S. education. There are multiple ways in which one can be rational or scientific. Different approaches to science offer the U.S. research community different visions of social and educational affairs. They also further different interests by defining what is appropriate, desirable and possible. The way in which we seek systematic understanding and reflection about the world responds to a particular setting and culture and its language.

SCIENCE AS MULTIPLE PARADIGMS

A casual glance at the research in social studies education finds a number of different styles of discourse. By styles of discourse, I mean ways in which people talk about their purposes, procedures and findings of study. These styles of discourse contain different assumptions about the meaning of science, about the "nature" of the social world, and about how that world should be interpreted and changed. For example, some researchers talk about determining how certain teaching strategies or curriculum materials can be made more effective to achieve specific social studies objectives. The appropriateness of this research is argued through the rigor of its procedures, often associated with the use of statistical techniques of analysis and interpretation.

A second style of research gives emphasis to a narrative about the events and interactions in a particular school or classroom. This research is often called ethnography. The narrative is a portrayal of the "culture" of schools. Research focuses upon how people use language or how roles, values, and beliefs are established through the interactions of those who participate in school life—teachers, students and administrators. Definitions of achievement, competence or role are viewed as having no prior or objective definition, but as being established in the processes of social interaction.

A third type of accounting of school life and instruction involves a critical debunking motif. This form of discourse "tells" us about how institutional conditions create particular ways of thinking and reasoning and then seeks to relate these conditions to larger social issues of cultural, social and economic change. The research is concerned with how our feelings, beliefs, concepts of self and knowledge relate to ideologies and how particular social forms limit and create human possibilities.

The differences in research are sometimes treated as technical. Some researchers talk about the differences between quantitative (statistical) and qualitative (ethnographic or case study) research and often conclude by saying that research should have both types of data. These distinctions are technical, because they focus upon the procedures of data gathering and not the conceptual focus, assumptions, purposes, or implications of inquiry. To make a technical distinction in talking about research, however, is not without import for our understanding of science. It helps to sustain a myth that the researcher is an apolitical and detached observer whose only concern is to know, understand and explain. To focus upon technique as the essential quality of science is to ignore the social quality of science and to deny that the language of research contains value and interest.

Differences among the styles of discourse reflect much more than differences in research technique. These different styles of discourse reflect different disciplinary matrices or paradigms. Each paradigm involves interrelated values, beliefs, concepts and technologies. To affiliate with a paradigm has profound implications for what is made problematic about schools, individuality and society. Differences represent competing visions about the "nature" of society and schooling. Further, paradigms of educational research respond to and change in relation to larger social and political conditions and transformations. What is plausible and acceptable as research is determined in relation to our larger social and cultural conditions.

Research is not neutral. It orients us to purposes and goals of schools as much as does any overt statement of policy and, because of the tacit quality of its dispositions, science may be more influential than statements of purpose. The problem of science as technical efficiency, negotiations among people or forms of domination suggests ways to act towards what is legitimate and possible in school and society.

To make the interrelations of research practices, paradigms and society clearer, three different paradigms of educational research are explored. These paradigms are called empirical-analytic, symbolic, and critical sciences. Social studies research illustrates the scope of questions, procedures and social assumptions that underlie each. In the discussion following, each paradigm is viewed historically to understand how these paradigms developed in their particular U.S. context. The last section considers how each paradigm establishes a way of thinking about the teaching of social studies.

Empirical-Analytic Sciences

The dominant approach to social science research can be called empirical-analytic. It is empirical, based upon what can be observed or made observable. It is analytic in its attempt to separate human behaviors into constituent elements, presumably discrete variables that can be studied in isolation. Often, this approach to research is called behavioral science and, in psychology, behaviorism. It encompasses many conceptual perspectives, from recent advances in information processing to organization and administrative theory in sociology.

The purpose of empirical-analytic science is to develop the appropriate technique to realize specified outcomes under given conditions. Theories of teaching or learning, for example, are concerned with identifying the most efficient ways to produce predetermined outcomes, such as achievement on standardized tests. Research typically focuses upon effects. Three types of "effects" questions are often raised.

One "effects" question focuses on how behavior can be influenced or changed. In social studies teacher education, for example, research is designed to assess the impact of training upon classroom performance. Studies attempt to develop and field-test precise and transportable training systems. Napier and VanSickle (1981), for example, sought to determine the relative effectiveness of micro-teaching compared to field experience approaches to social studies teacher training. They based their assessment on supervisor ratings of behaviors displayed during student-teaching. Statistical analyses revealed few significant differences between the two approaches. The statistically significant differences favored the field experience group, and the authors concluded that the results demonstrated the superiority of the field-based methods course.

A second "effects" question addresses the relationships among teacher characteristics, teacher behaviors, and curriculum/student outcomes, such as achievement or attitudes. In one study (Blankenship 1983), the research identified whether 8th graders' social studies learning would be improved through the use of visual materials, such as diagrams. The intent of this research was practical—to identify an approach that might facilitate learning. One hundred and eighty-nine 8th grade students were randomly assigned to control and experimental groups. Prior knowledge was assessed according to a criterion-referenced test. Each group was taught according to the same materials except for the inclusion of transparencies with the experimental group. While no significant differences were found, it was assumed that direct relationships could be identified between student outcomes and some behavioral variables.

A third "effects" question focuses upon specific attitudes or behaviors of teachers or prospective teachers. White (1982), for example, sought to validate a scale of teachers' perceptions of social studies. Three traditions of social education (social studies as citizenship transmission, as social science and as reflective inquiry) were represented in the instrument to measure teacher perceptions. White's research was to establish statistical reliability and validity of the instrument. The questionnaire instrument was distributed to 190 secondary school social studies teachers. While finding that the teachers did not identify with a single tradition, the author concluded that the instrument is useful in indicating teacher preferences in teaching social studies.

From these three types of questions and examples we can begin to identify certain assumptions and beliefs that underlie empirical-analytic science. These are:

- Generalizations should be universal, that is, not bound to a specific context or to the actual circumstances from which the generalizations are formed. The statistical analyses in the cited studies are used to decontextualize knowledge so that findings seem to have cross-situational and historical validity.

- Related to the search for universals is a commitment to a disinterested science. Research findings are believed to be independent of the goals and values that people bring to a situation. Blankenship's research on effective teacher strategies accepts the content and purposes of the lesson and seeks only to understand how given purposes can be implemented in the most effective manner.
- There is a belief that a classroom contains a system of distinct and analytically separable parts, which are called variables. Each variable is treated as independent of others and analyzed statistically to identify cause or interaction. Use of transparencies, for example, was defined as a variable that can be controlled independent of contextual features of ongoing situations. The view of "variable" introduces a belief about causation. This belief is that cause is linear and directional: "If one does X, Y will be the effect."
- Formal knowledge is sought primarily through the quantification of data. Variables are to be made precise and clear so that invariant definitions can be tested and data compared. Mathematics is to eliminate human values and provide the highest form of theoretical knowledge.

We can summarize the practices and assumptions of empirical-analytic research by considering its particular style of thought. Knowledge is concerned with identifying the most efficient ways to accomplish predetermined outcomes. Goals are considered as distinct from practice and examined separately. Goals and purposes cannot be measured scientifically; only behavior that can be observed is examined. Furthermore, the field of human action is thought to have distinct analytically separate, sequential and hierarchical qualities that can be identified, tested and validated. The larger social framework by which social goals and interests are chosen, technologies applied and systems established is of little or no concern.

How does this style of discourse direct our thinking about schooling, teaching and learning? By posing the question in this manner, we can approach science as existing within a larger set of cultural assumptions that make the activities of research seem plausible. Empirical-analytic sciences rest on a cultural belief that knowledge can be treated objectively and neutrally, that schooling can be organized in an efficient and effective manner for transmitting that knowledge, and that problems of curriculum are psychological and individual in origin.

The "effects" research also posits a belief that teaching and learning have clear and precise procedures that can be identified to make schooling more efficient and effective. Management systems of instruction, behavioral objectives and criterion-referenced measures are but a few examples of ways in which people and knowledge are to be organized according to this view.

The purpose of schooling is to efficiently and objectively transmit predetermined knowledge. The problem for research and schooling is to make this socialization process more administratively efficient.

Symbolic Sciences

A different way to think about schooling, teaching and learning is offered by the symbolic sciences. Emerging from European idealist traditions and linguistic philosophy, the symbolic sciences give attention to the patterns of communication and interaction that shape life in schools. It is argued that social rules are made and sustained through the interactions of people. These rules give coherence to our everyday activities and meaning to our roles. Science is to understand these interpretive rules and meanings. Symbolic interactionism, ethnomethodology, phenomenology and case studies are conceptual variations within the symbolic sciences.

The symbolic sciences make language central to interpretation of social intention. A unique quality of our human condition is the invention of language and other symbols that communicate meaning in daily life. One could look at the citizen roles and "the right to vote" in a variety of countries such as the United States, the Soviet Union and Japan. In each country, the meaning of citizenship and the act of voting are part of a larger cultural and social system. To vote in each country is to participate in different symbol systems of meaning and interaction.

The symbolic sciences involve consideration of three further notions: intersubjectivity, human intent and purpose. In each situation, people interact and develop consensual norms that bind them into patterned ways of acting. A teacher enters a classroom, for example, and assumes a role in relation to that context. But as any teacher realizes, the formal definitions of a role are modified as people negotiate their position in the situation. The teacher interacts with children to establish a consensus about the rules and norms of classroom life, to some extent varying patterns and expectations from situation to situation. The interaction and reciprocity of roles involves people intersubjectively defining their situation.

Intent and purpose are considered in relation to two types of causation. One type of cause is "because of." The cause of an event is tied to a previous event. The empirical-analytic sciences typically consider this type of cause. A second type of cause is "in order to." An individual intentionally does a particular act in order to bring about something in the future. Symbolic scientists argue that both types of causation are to be explored to understand social affairs.

"Elementary School Teachers' Planning for Social Studies and Other Subjects" (McCutcheon 1981) illustrates certain aspects of the symbolic paradigm. The author questions whether instructional planning involves a sequential and logical structure as suggested in the empirical-analytic literature. Researchers observed 12 classrooms, interviewed the teachers and collected a variety of classroom documents, such as teacher plan books, teacher guides to published textbooks and children's daily work. The data revealed that teacher planning is a practical activity dealing with situationally specific problems. Interruptions (like notes from the office), scheduling and textbook use, as well as teacher skill and knowledge about the subject matter influenced the teachers' decisions. Teacher planning, the author concludes,

> involves a complex, simultaneous juggling of many questions and information about past practices, subject matter, children and materials. Planning does not follow the objectives. . . . Rather, it accounts for far more information, follows different patterns, and is more complex than the objectives-first model. (McCutcheon 1981, 64)

Teacher planning is not taken for granted in this study. It is considered as a socially constructed activity that is defined by the interactions among teachers, students and administrators.

Symbolic sciences maintain different assumptions than those of the empirical-analytic sciences. Social reality is defined by the patterns of communication by which people make and sustain social rules. Intent and purpose are perceived as significant to classroom activities. There are, however, certain assumptions of symbolic science that are compatible with empirical-analytic science. For example, there is the belief that theory can be descriptive and detached. By this I mean that the interpretations provided by this paradigm are thought of as neutral with respect to the power relations within school and society.

How does this style of discourse direct our thinking about schooling, teaching and learning? What is the quality of mind that underlies the concerns, priorities and procedures of this paradigm? There is a de-emphasis on the predetermined quality of social structure and knowledge. The research paradigm emphasizes inter- and intrapersonal skills, the active participation of students, the social basis of knowledge, individual autonomy and personal responsibility. Ideas are to be treated as permeable and provisional. Roles are flexible and involve intersubjective negotiations.

We can begin here exploring a relationship between the worldview that orients a research paradigm and a particular pedagogy of education. Open education, the British Infant School and certain U.S. curriculum development projects of the 1960s, such as *Man: A Course of Study,* reflect the assumptions found in the symbolic sciences. There is a link between a particular form of research, pedagogy and purposes of schooling. The symbolic sciences maintain themes and social assumptions that are consistent with the ideological purposes of progressive education. The research makes the general tenets of progressive beliefs about the design and operation of schooling plausible and legitimate. When one examines the methods by which advocates evaluate these curriculum practices, they are found to be similar to those discussed here as symbolic science.

Critical Sciences

A third paradigm can be called "critical." It draws upon two different strands of Western thought. One is Marxist. The second, which developed as a liberal response to Marxist analysis, is the sociology of knowledge. In part, critical sciences seek to understand the assumptions, implications and consequences of the rapid technologicalization of work, the role of mass communication and the growth of institutions that increasingly direct people's public and private lives. The critical sciences are concerned with the political implications of our social arrangements. Their purpose is to demystify the patterns of knowledge and social conditions that produce domination and restrict human possibilities.

Within the critical sciences, the sociology of knowledge is concerned with critiquing the dominant culture and seeks to identify alternatives to existing structures. Research might involve examination of the social studies education made available to students from different social classes or cultural groups. Observations of classroom interaction and use of curriculum focus on differences in expectations and practices related to social class or culture. The research seeks to reveal how norms and values of social class, culture and gender are transmitted through classroom communication patterns. Such knowledge, it is reasoned, helps teachers understand the assumptions and implications of their practices, thus opening a search for alternatives providing greater social justice.

A second strand of the critical sciences stands in opposition to the dominant culture, its values and institutions. The research task is to guide people in establishing new meanings, practices and relationships. Much of this second strand draws upon Marxist analysis and is politically linked to other groups who seek to establish socialist policies. Giroux and Penna (1979), for example, focus upon the "ideological messages embedded in both the content of the formal curriculum and the social relations of the classroom encounters" (see also Giroux 1983). Anyon (1978, 1979) examines the content of social studies textbooks as an example of how schooling legitimates prevailing political and economic arrangements.

The political view of schooling poses a problem for researchers and educators: what is their role in constructing new social structures? This role, it is argued, is to demystify the complex social forces in which schools are embedded and reveal the workings of society and alternative possibilities.

Certain qualities of thought characterize both the sociology of knowledge and Marxist analysis. One, the purpose of science is critique rather than description or explanation. Inquiry is to unravel the dynamics of contemporary society *as a historical phenomenon*. By illuminating the assumptions, implications and historical roots of our social situation, people can begin to identify possible alternatives. Choices come not from prescription or manipulation but from illumination. Second, there is a link between inquiry and practice. The link is not direct, technical, or mechanical. By making knowledge relevant to questions of domination and illuminating constraints, reasonable choices are created for practice. Third, change is not linear or additive; it involves contradictions and transformation in social and political conditions. What occurs as teaching and learning in social studies classrooms is dynamically related to our cultural contexts.

How does this style of discourse direct our thinking about schooling, teaching and learning? This paradigm is possibly the most difficult to assess because there are as yet few examples of teaching incorporating these ideas of critique. During the early 1900s, there were worker and socialist educational programs in the United States, but they became less visible following World War II. Certain elements of such education appear in recent radical pedagogical discussions (see Apple 1982; Giroux 1983). What knowledge is selected and organized for curriculum and whose interests are served or handicapped are major concerns. A focus of these discussions is how people can come to understand the history of social interests, the ways in which oppression and domination function in contemporary societies. Carr and Kemmis (1983), for example, give attention to how teachers can engage a critical theory to systematically alter their practice. Educational theory, they argue, "must be concerned with identifying and exposing those aspects of the existing social order which frustrate the pursuit of rational goals and offer theoretical accounts which make teachers aware of how they may be eliminated or overcome" (p. 128). The aim of such theory and research is to help teachers improve their own practices.

SOCIAL CONTEXTS AND RESEARCH PARADIGMS

In this section, the three research paradigms are related to their historical contexts. Educational science exists within a milieu of social problems, struggles and contradictions in which people seek overarching definitions about how society works and changes. Our commonsense beliefs about what is and what ought to be provide background to our research efforts. A sense of that history—outlining issues, tensions and hopes that helped to shape and fashion the activities of research—is provided.

Educational research in the United States emerged as an organized activity at the turn of the 20th century (see Joncich 1968; Johanningmeier 1980). Its development was related to the separation of social sciences, history and psychology from philosophy and the creation of academic departments within the university. The discipline of psychology, however, dominated pedagogical thought and research in the United States.

The creation of professionalized research communities responded to changes in economic, social and political life. After the Civil War (1865), there was a shift in the occupational structure of the middle class. Professional occupations began to emerge whose "capital" was the creation and control of knowledge in particular institutions. In addition to the formation of the social disciplines, the "helping" professions, such as teaching, began to form and gain position within university structures. It is interesting to note that many of the early social scientists were sons of Protestant ministers. The work of social science seemed to maintain a sense of calling, but oriented in an earthward direction.[2]

Many of the leading social scientists were members of the middle class who feared the changing values associated with the movement to urban centers and the demise of community that resulted from industrialization. Their response was to unite science with the early Protestant commitment to human improvement on earth, believing that social and psychological science could point to a more efficient and effective moral organization of society.

A utilitarian orientation permeated most of the social sciences by the 20th century, and educational sciences became subservient to a "practical" psychology. This was a response, in part, to the perceived needs of rapid industrialization and urbanization accompanied by massive immigration. The immigrants of Eastern and Southern Europe, whose values and languages seemed alien and threatening to those already established in the United States, posed a special problem. The difficulties of socialization and assimilation seemed most straightforward when considered as problems of learning and administration. Educational psychologists and sociologists in the early 1900s could draw upon research methods developed first in industry and later by the military.

The empirical-analytic sciences can be understood as emerging, along with mass education, from particular state and social interests to efficiently process both people and ideas. Its hope was reformist, to promote the common good. The method was to provide "objective," measurable data about how "things" are working. The assumption was (and is) that precise information can guide the operation of social institutions including schools.

We can identify the origins of U.S. symbolic sciences in the work of George Herbert Mead (1863–1931), although there were prior and simultaneous philosophical developments in both Europe and the United States. Mead was influential in introducing the philosophical tenets of pragmatism into discussions about social science. Mead's social psychology represented a benevolent idealism, confident that the problems of society could be solved. Pragmatism, however, provided a particular orientation to this idealism. Mead rejected socialist and laissez-faire doctrines that were prevalent at the time (Schwendinger and Schwendinger 1974). Instead, he stressed individual problem solving and the formation of individuality in relation to interactions with others. Mead believed that the social order was formed from the collective attitudes of individuals and thus could be reformed. He argued that reform was piecemeal. Long range social planning was not possible because of the evolutionary quality of society.

The early writing of Mead involved a specific discussion of educational issues and was influential in the formation of John Dewey's pedagogy (see Mills 1964; Franklin 1975). However, the impact of pragmatism upon the development of symbolic educational sciences was inconsequential for the first half of the 20th century (see Bogdan and Biklen 1982 for a historical review). There was, for example, Willard Waller's *Sociology of Teaching* (1932) and Hollinghead's *Elmstown Youth* (1949), but these research efforts remained outside the mainstream until their "discovery" in the 1960s. Waller's "popularist suspicion of appearances" and his conviction that sociology should "consider pleasing exteriors as concealing something embarrassing" was not intellectually accepted at the time. He was treated as an outsider by fellow sociologists, and his works were neglected in both sociology and education (Lasch 1977).

It is not until the 1960s that systematic efforts were undertaken to develop research consistent with the assumptions of the symbolic sciences. The emergence of the symbolic research in curriculum was, in part, a response to school administration and federal agency demands for "rational" assessment. As the federal government became more involved in school programs, objective measures were sought to determine the worth of innovations, and formal evaluation became an important part of curriculum development.

The demand for rational evaluation caught open classroom educators in a political bind. They were to provide "data" about the benefits of the progressive pedagogy, yet conventional measures of outcome-effects did not focus upon the main goals of open education. The symbolic sciences offered an alternative approach whose emphasis upon patterns of communication and tentativeness of knowledge provided a research paradigm that was compatible with the assumptions of progressive education.

The coalescence of symbolic sciences and progressive education in the 1960s was also related to transformations that were occurring in the general society. Symbolic sciences and progressive education responded to the socialization requirements of the "new middle class" of professionals. The tentativeness of knowledge and ambiguities of role are important in preparing children for the expectations and demands of the professional in society (see Holmes 1982).

The symbolic sciences provide important political images in our times. They offer a means of reducing feelings of dislocation and anomie caused by the increasing division of labor and fragmentation found in schooling and in society. Embedded in the symbolic sciences are themes of negotiated reality, pluralism and individual efficacy that reassert fundamental liberal ideas (see Popkewitz 1984). The symbolic sciences provide a vision of the social world that reaffirms the possibility of liberal ideals of individual efficiency and pluralism. The theories and methods create a style of thought that expresses hopes about a social order that appears threatened by the impersonalization of society. Their themes become important as our cultural and political beliefs are threatened and new symbols of reconcilation and social cohesion are sought.

While the critical sciences gained legitimacy during the same period as the symbolic sciences, they offered a different response to the social, political and intellectual conflicts of the 1960s. The Vietnam War protests and civil rights demonstrations highlighted certain inequities in the processes and consequences of schooling. The conflict perspective in critical research articulated the uneasiness some felt as cherished values were challenged. Critical sciences sought to frame relationships between children's "life experiences" in schools and larger social issues. Furthermore, the school was seen not only as a context for understanding social contradictions. It could also become a focal point for radical transformation of society.

A difficulty that the critical sciences face in the context of our cultural life stems from the premise of interpretive rather than directly useful knowledge. We have become accustomed to the claim that knowledge should be practical and directly applicable to "problem solving." There is also a tendency of mainstream research to make our social affairs seem "natural" and ahistorical. This process of reification works against social change and acceptance of new patterns of conduct, including the conduct of research. The argument that a debunking knowledge has value in social reconstruction receives little recognition or acceptance. A purpose of critical sciences is to make tradition, language and social arrangement understood as humanly constructed rather than naturally ordained. This demystifying motif works counter to prevailing beliefs and institutional arrangements.

Yet, to point to social conditions that limit a widespread acceptance of a critical science is to also acknowledge the increasing legitimacy of critical sciences within academia in the United States. Publications of journals and texts devoted to sociology of knowledge and Marxist theory have increased approximately tenfold in the past decade. Critical perspectives also have become part of some state commissions and work groups on education.

It is important to note that both the symbolic and critical sciences gain legitimacy in a time of economic expansion. The 1960s was a period of profound economic expansion that also enlarged the "high" cultural base of society. The arts, sciences and humanities received increasing support. Universities entered a period of rapid expansion that continued into the late 1970s. The number of people who attended universities increased dramatically, as did the number of doctorates and academically oriented jobs. The expansion provided room for alternative and oppositional traditions. They could exist alongside of the utilitarian, empirical-analytic sciences without seriously challenging the later's cultural authority. Many of the researchers who do symbolic and critical research received their first academic appointments during this period of expansion. Today, they are among the senior professors who teach graduate students and are recognized leaders in their fields.

SOME CONCLUDING COMMENTS ABOUT SCIENCE, SCHOOLING AND PURPOSE

In considering social studies research in an unconventional manner, and exploring it as a way of thinking, "seeing," acting and talking about the world of schooling, I used the historian's notion of "climate of opinion" to wonder about the assumptions that shape and fashion our practices.

It soon become obvious that to wonder about social studies research involves a complexity that goes beyond the particular strategies and findings of social studies research. Social studies is considered a part of a more general community of educational science. Social studies receives definition, standards, and acceptability from the larger context of educational research.

To view social studies research as a specific domain of educational science, however, is not enough. What passes as scientific knowledge is culturally and socially bound. The values, visions and practices of educational research are related to strains and struggles in our society. Each of three paradigms emerges and responds to intellectual, social and political conditions.

We can now return to the questions posed initially. First, what are the styles of social studies research? U.S. educational research is not a unidimensional activity. It contains multiple traditions, conflicting purposes and divergent visions of science, schooling and society. The paradigms are not only a means of conducting science but also expressions of our human hopes and interests. This conclusion provides a way of responding to the second question: Why are these three paradigms plausible in the U.S. context? The answer was sought historically in relation to the interplay of intellectual, social, political and economic conditions. The interrelation of our sciences and our social world, however, is not necessarily direct or articulated in public statements about method or purpose of science. The social significance of science is carried in its assumptions that shape the formation and interpretation of social practice.

These observations lead to the last question. How are these sciences related to the establishment of meaning and purpose for schooling? First, we need to recognize that science is a valued commodity in our society. Its language and procedures are used to give credibility to institutional practices. Much of the folklore and practices of learning, teaching or classroom organization are made to seem reasonable by our research. Second, the descriptive and interpretive quality of science has a way of acting back upon institutional life. The conceptions of science held by the early educational psychologists, such as Thorndike, gave organization to scientific curriculum management efforts and directly influenced spelling and arithmetic curriculum. This way of organizing curriculum is still with us, although in a more refined way, as instructional management systems, criterion-referenced measures and taxonomies of learning. The language and manner of defining problems associated with science become a part of schooling. Educational research functions then in multiple ways—it is at once descriptive, interpretative and prescriptive.

There is a third element to the relationship of science and the social meaning and purpose of schooling. Science expresses multiple and conflicting "climates of opinion." The values, beliefs and practices of empirical-analytic, symbolic or critical sciences "place" us in an important relationship to larger political and philosophical issues. Paradigms contain assumptions of individuality, authority and social order. The categories of research also guide, define and give value to certain dynamics of social life while, at the same time, denying worth to other elements.

Through an examination of the assumptions and dispositional quality of science, we can begin to consider the relation between science and human purpose. The empirical-analytical sciences define purpose as administrative efficiency, the symbolic sciences as the effectiveness of communication among participants in social situations, and the critical sciences as altering the distribution of power underlying social patterns. Science reflects larger social interests, affiliations and commitments of which we should be aware. Our different sciences and pedagogies are linked socially and philosophically, responding to particular social transformations. Social studies research is not neutral.

NOTES

This paper was originally prepared for a Seminar on Social Education in Japan and the United States, Kyoto, Japan, 1983. I wish to thank the editor, Catherine Cornbleth, for her comments during preparation of this revision.

[1] This and the following section are discussed more fully in T. Popkewitz, 1984.

[2] The formative years in the development of teaching as an organized occupation also responded to the idea of "calling" and moral imperatives of religion. See Mattingly, 1975.

REFERENCES

Anyon, J. "Elementary Social Studies Textbooks and Legitimating Knowledge." *Theory and Research in Social Education.* 6 (September 1978): 40–55.

Anyon, J. "Education, Social 'Structure' and the Power of Individuals." *Theory and Research in Social Education.* 7 (Spring 1979): 49–59.

Apple, M. *Education and Power.* Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982.

Becker, C. *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers.* New Haven: Yale University, 1932.

Bogdan, R., and S. Biklen. *Qualitative Research for Education, An Introduction to Theory and Methods.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1982.

Blankenship, G., Jr. "The Use of Visual Diagrams with Eighth Grade Social Studies Students at Four Ability Levels." *Journal of Social Studies Research.* 7 (Spring 1983): 23–44.

Carr, W., and S. Kemmis. *Becoming Critical: Knowing Through Action Research.* GeeLong, Victoria, Australia: Deakin University, 1983.

Franklin, B. "George Herbert Mead, Curriculum Theorist: The Curriculum Field and the Problem of Social Control." Paper presented at symposium, Historical Studies Within the Curriculum Field, American Educational Research Association Convention, Washington, DC, April 1975.

Foucault, M. *The Order of Things, An Archeology of the Human Sciences.* New York. Vintage Books, 1970.

Giroux, Henry. *Theory and Resistance in Education.* South Hadley, MA: Bergen and Garvey Publisher, 1983.

Giroux, Henry, and A. Penna. "Social Education in the Classroom, Dynamics of the Hidden Curriculum." *Theory and Research in Social Education.* 7 (Spring 1979): 21–42.

Hollingshead, A. *Elmstown's Youth.* New York: John Wiley, 1949.

Holmes, M. "The New Middle Class and the Organization of Curricular Knowledge." *Theory and Research in Social Education.* 10 (Summer 1982): 33–44.

Johanningmeier, E. "The Worker Bees: The Origin Of American Educational Research," paper presented at Middle Atlantic States Philosophy of Education Society, Princeton, NJ, March 27, 1980.

Joncich, G. *The Sane Positivist, A Bibliography of Edward Thorndike.* Middleton, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1968.

Lasch, C. *Haven in a Heartless World: The Family Besieged.* New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Mattingly, Paul H. *The Classless Profession: American Schoolmen of the Nineteenth Century.* New York: New York University Press, 1975.

McCutcheon, G. "Elementary School Teachers' Planning for Social Studies and Other Subjects," *Theory and Research in Social Education.* 9 (Spring 1981): 45–66.

Mills, C. *Sociology and Pragmatism: The Higher Learning in America.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Napier, J., and R. VanSickle. "Evaluation of Peer Microteaching and Field Experience Component in a Secondary Level Social Studies Preservice Teacher Education Program." *Journal of Social Studies Research,* 5 (1): 1–8.

Popkewitz, Thomas S. *Paradigm and Ideology in Educational Research, The Social Functions of the Intellectual.* London and Philadelphia: Falmer Press, 1984.

Popkewitz, Thomas S. "A Sociological Perspective: The Solitude and the Crowd." In *Individualization and the Common Curriculum,* edited by G. Fenstermacher and J. Goodlad, 82nd Yearbook. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1983.

Schwendinger, H., and J. Schwendinger. *The Sociologists of the Chair, A Radical Analysis of the Formative Years of North American Sociology, 1883–1922.* New York: Basic Books, 1974.

Waller, Willard. *The Sociology of Teaching.* New York: John Wiley & Son, 1932.

White, C. "A Validation Study of the Barth-Shermis Social Studies Preference Scale." *Theory and Research in Social Education.* 10 (Summer 1982): 1–20.

CHAPTER 3

SURVEY RESEARCH

Dennie L. Smith

Surveys are probably the most commonly used research procedure for obtaining information and opinions. The assumption is that the best way to find out what people are thinking is to ask them.

Survey research is characterized by the collection of data from a sampling of a given population, usually through questionnaires and interviews. Surveys can be one of the least expensive means of communicating with a large number of people in a short time, and information of this type can be particularly valuable to decision makers, especially when public opinion or mass behavior explanations are important. Although people may sometimes be suspicious of surveys, resulting in their offering false or distorted information, surveys are a valid means of determining the present state of a given phenomena. They are also used to gather data to describe the nature of existing conditions or the relationships among conditions, such as school achievement and socioeconomic factors.

Opinion polls, a combined form of questionnaire and interview, have been popularized by the mass media and are a common survey procedure for acquiring information about political or economic inclinations. Political careers and decisions are often influenced by the opinions of constituents. Economic surveys often probe consumer desires and tastes about new products and trends. Companies test the success of new ventures in the early stages by conducting surveys to collect information for making modifications and planning future advertising. Surveys are used to determine how workers perceive their work or how students rate their schools or the subjects they are studying. For example, Goodlad's report (1984) that junior and senior high students rated social studies among the least useful subjects for their present and future needs was derived from survey research. Such information, which can be extremely important for curriculum reform, is often difficult to obtain in any other way.

This kind of research often appeals to the novice researcher since, on the surface, the intricacies of questionnaire development and data analysis are not apparent. The reliability and validity of survey data are a function of the quality of the overall research design for the study. If the survey is not adequately developed, the results can be trivial, misleading or meaningless. A direct relationship exists between the quality of the survey instrument and the information that is generated.

Survey research is often criticized because of its so-called lack of rigor compared to experimental research. Primarily, the criticism centers on the lack of control of specific variables in survey studies. By definition, surveys are intended to describe present phenomena in their natural state. Other research procedures are usually not feasible for this purpose, since variables cannot always be controlled in the natural setting. Many of the more rigorous and most respected studies have evolved from survey research (see Cohen and Manion 1980).

In order to avoid the pitfalls of faulty design, the following factors need to be considered in constructing survey studies: objectives and hypotheses, literature review, resources, and sampling. The order of presentation is not intended to suggest a linear sequence of steps. Some knowledge of the relevant literature, for example, should precede formulation of research objectives. Or, limited resources might necessitate elimination of some initial objectives. In the sections that follow, examples of actual research studies are cited for clarification and illustration.

OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESES

Precise objectives for the study are helpful in focusing on the phenomena of interest and determining the information needed to answer specific questions. In this phase, the population as well as the research questions are identified. In other words, what is the area of interest and what information is needed (see Campbell 1963)?

The purpose of one study, for example, was to determine student perceptions of school life (Smith and Woody 1980). The researchers had to decide on the specific aspects of school life to consider and then develop questions for students. Would the study focus on academic or social school life? Should the study focus on elementary or high school students? Or a specific grade level?

Propositions are generated, presumably from a theoretical framework, in the form of hypotheses to guide data gathering. Hypotheses are theoretical hunches about the relationships that exist among phenomena. For example, a researcher might suspect that a relationship exists between social science knowledge and citizenship behavior. Hypotheses to investigate this question can be put in question or statement form, depending upon the researcher's preference or upon the data collection and analysis techniques. In addition, precise definitions must be given to such factors as "social science knowledge" and "citizenship behavior" in order to measure them.

Hypotheses for the study of students' perceptions of school life (Smith and Woody 1980) were stated in the following questions:

1. Do students in private school and public school settings differ in their perceptions of school-life factors?
2. Do male and female students differ in their perceptions of school-life factors?
3. Do black and white students differ in their perceptions of school-life factors? (Examples of school-life factors are grades, being with peers, teacher approval, running errands and tests).

The researcher must identify the most important and useful information to test the hypotheses or to answer the research questions. It is important to think through this phase thoroughly, because acquiring essential information after the questioning is difficult. Information should be carefully evaluated for its utility; it may be significant or interesting, but not relevant to the questions. When the researcher gathers specific information, it should be used in the analysis. If it is not needed or does not contribute to answering the research questions, it is not necessary.

For example, in the study described above, information regarding students' school life in the academic and social areas was needed. Information concerning family situations would not have been useful. Obviously, a question about the impact of the home on school life might be important, but not for this particular study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Clearly, it is important for a researcher to know the current status of the topic under investigation. A thorough literature review reveals what is already known and what needs to be learned in a given area. It may provide all the necessary information, eliminating the need for the study and saving time and expense. If a similar study has been done, the investigator may choose to replicate it and compare the results. Replications may be useful when the information needed is the same but the conditions have changed (see Weisberg and Bowen 1977).

Most important, comparative information helps in the evaluation and interpretation of the findings of a study. The experience and findings of others are invaluable to thorough investigations that contribute to the advancement of knowledge. Each study may or may not substantiate previous findings, either contributing to the strength of previously gained knowledge or perhaps generating new insights.

Interviews with experts familiar with the topic are an excellent way to initiate a review. Published sources, such as the journal *Review of Educational Research* and ERIC's *Research in Education,* are examples that can be useful in determining the current status of many areas of investigation (see Richardson 1983).

In our sample study, it was necessary to review the literature regarding students' perceptions of their school life. Such topics as stress and attitudinal studies were examined for more information on these areas. Interviews with school psychologists, teachers and principals can also be helpful in formulating a study.

RESOURCES

Financial resources are a reality that must be considered before making elaborate plans concerning specific procedures and data-analysis techniques. Consideration must also be given to how many staff members, students, volunteers or others are available to assist and how much time they have.

Most research efforts can be maximized through utilization of computer technology. Technical assistance, which usually requires financial resources, may be necessary for this and to develop proper data-analysis techniques (see Jessen 1973).

In studying students' perceptions of school life, the researchers faced limited financial and staff resources. Consequently, two schools, a private one and an inner city one in an urban environment, were chosen. Interviews would have been ideal, but the limited staff, funds and time prohibited their use.

SAMPLING

Identifying the population for a study is a primary decision before considering sampling procedures. The population must be clearly defined to determine who is included and excluded. A population can be any designated group, such as consumers who buy video games, voters, pet owners, real estate agents, presidents of companies, union representatives or teachers.

Due to the expense and the impractical task of including all members of a population in a study, a smaller group—or sample—is selected to represent the larger group. The size of the sample varies according to the nature of the study and the population size: the larger the population, the larger the sample. A well-chosen sample is considered reliable for examining the entire group's opinions and for making valid generalizations regarding the group as a whole. A sampling error occurs when the sample fails to accurately represent the population under study.

Sampling can be more or less representative of the population. Less representative procedures include quota sampling where the most readily available people are used in the study. Quotas are met through obtaining a specific number of participants or percentages of certain groups. A researcher may want to determine the musical interest of 16 year olds, 60 percent of whom are female and 40 percent male. If there is a reason to expect that musical interest varies by gender, techniques should be directed toward finding the largest number of available people to interview to meet the 60–40 percent gender ratio.

More representative approaches include random sampling, stratified sampling and systematic sampling. In random sampling, each member of the entire population has an equal chance of being selected for the study. Names of the population can be placed in a box and drawn at random for a representative sample.

For example, if a researcher wants to interview social studies teachers of the Mid-National School System for a study about their working conditions, all the teachers' names (735) should be placed in a box, mixed and 20 percent, or 147, selected to respond to a work-condition interview. Another procedure uses random numbers selected by a computer to identify the sample. A disadvantage of this procedure is that the names of the entire population may not be readily available (see Weisberg and Bowen 1977).

In a stratified random sample, the population is divided into subgroups according to theoretically important characteristics so that the groups can be compared. For example, a stratified random sample might divide the teachers of the Mid-National School System into groups of male (25 percent) and female (75 percent). Again, a random process would be used to select the male and female subgroups.

Systematic sampling consists of making selections from a listing of a population based on set intervals. The intervals are set every nth (5th, 10th, or 100th) name to obtain the sample for the study. To select a sample of teachers from the Mid-National School System, the names of all the teachers would be listed in alphabetical order with every 5th one selected for the study.

In the previously described study of student perceptions of school life, time and resources were limited, thus making it necessary to select the sample from a private and a public school in a large metropolitan area. Random sampling was used to select the population from each grade level in the respective schools. Although broad generalizations cannot be made with respect to a national population from this limited sample, the same hypotheses can be tested in an expanded study. Since the publication of this study, other researchers and teachers have requested the use of the instrumentation for further investigation. This is but one example of how research can be conducted on a limited scale and extended by other interested parties with greater resources.

Once decisions have been made regarding the information necessary for testing the hypotheses, procedures for collecting data can be determined within the constraints of resources. The two most commonly used are the interview and the questionnaire. Some of the major characteristics, advantages and limitations of interviews and questionnaires must be considered to make an appropriate selection.

INTERVIEW

An interview consists of verbal interaction either in person or by telephone. The success of an interview depends upon the interviewer's ability to communicate specific questions and to motivate the respondent to cooperate and answer the questions. Marketing research is often conducted by interviews. Most people have been stopped at some time in a large shopping mall or received a telephone call with a request to answer a few questions about a product. Of course, it requires trained interviewers to convince people to take the time and cooperate by responding to questions (see McGaw and Watson 1976).

Interview training is also helpful for minimizing bias while soliciting information during the interview. The personality of the interviewer can be a critical factor in the way individuals respond to questions. In addition, the manner in which the interviewer presents the questions may lead the respondents to answer in certain ways and thus bias the results. To minimize the effect of the interviewer on the respondent, interviewers are instructed to read the questions as written. Questions should be presented to all respondents in a uniform way.

The interview is an expensive process due to the amount of time required in the actual interview as well as in locating and making appointments with respondents. If more than one interviewer is involved, time and money must be expended for training so that the interviews are similar enough to yield comparable data. Telephone interviews are faster than personal interviews. Usually, the size of the population of the study must be adjusted to make the interviewing process cost effective. For example, a random sample of a population is an appropriate way to minimize the expenses as well as to provide generalizable information for a study.

The primary advantage of the interview is that it gives the respondent an opportunity to provide detailed and complete answers. The respondent has an opportunity to clarify the meaning of some of the questions and the interviewer can explore responses in depth, if necessary, in order to obtain complete answers to the questions (see Cohen and Manion 1980).

QUESTIONNAIRES

The questionnaire is used extensively in survey research because of its low cost with larger samples. It is a versatile instrument since it can be mailed for self-administration or administered in large groups by the researcher.

The five following factors should be considered in developing questionnaires (Weisberg and Bowen 1977):

1. Give careful attention to the wording and sequence of questions on the questionnaire. The questions must be clear and easy to understand. If they can be interpreted in various ways, then the responses will vary. The use of open-ended questions presents some difficulty for the researcher, since the responses have to be coded for data analysis. Open-ended questions, however, permit the respondent extensive freedom in answering the question and allow information concerning the "how" and "why" of the particular responses.

An example of the use of open-ended questionnaires can be found in the research of Newlove and Hall (1976) on teacher concerns in the use of innovations in teaching. The open-ended question posed by one study (see Smith and Smith 1984) was "What are your major concerns with respect to the teaching of social studies?" (The teaching of social studies was the innovation in this study.) Answers were then categorized into six areas according to a predetermined scheme developed through previous research with the model.

In a study to determine if there is a need for incorporating nuclear issues into a local school system's social studies curriculum, researchers can ask open-ended questions to find out whether local school children have fears and concerns similar to the national sample's (Beardslee and Mack 1981).

Sample Open-Ended Questions:

- What does the word "nuclear" bring to mind? Why?
- Do you think that you could survive a nuclear attack? Why?

George Gallop (1972) has described five considerations in designing interviews or questionnaires.

A. The filter or information stage can be used to find out whether the informant has thought about the issue prior to the interview. A filtering question about nuclear disarmament, for example, would be: "Have you considered the problem of disarmament?"

B. The free answer or open-ended question enables the informant to answer in his or her own words. For example, "How do you think our government leaders should respond to the nuclear disarmament issue?"

C. The dichotomous or specific answer question is used to restrict answers to Yes-No or predetermined multiple-choice responses. For example, "Do you think our leaders should initiate a super power conference to discuss nuclear disarmament?" ____ YES ____ NO

D. Questions can be designed to elicit the reasons an informant holds a particular view. For example, "Why do you think that our military should continue the build-up of nuclear weapons?"

E. Questions to find out the intensity of the informant's point of view may be included. For example, "What percentage of the national budget should be allocated to nuclear weapon development?" ____ 10% ____ 20% ____ 30% ____ 40%

Another way of finding out the intensity of a point of view is through the use of rating scales, which enable the respondents to reflect the intensity of their opinions by using dichotomous or multiple-response formats. Usually the rating scale arranges responses on a continuum and quantifies them for analysis; examples are the semantic-differential and the Likert-type.

Semantic-differential instruments are constructed using bipolar adjectives on a seven-point scale for adults and a five-point scale for younger respondents. This technique is especially useful for quantifying the intensity of opinions regarding value and attitude issues. Points of view are expressed by marking a blank on one of the semantic spaces (Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum 1957). An example of this type of format was used in the Dimensions of Introspection Instrument for assessing self-perceptions of individuals participating in assertive training sessions (Smith 1977).

Sample Semantic Differential Items:

DIRECTIONS: The following words were selected to enable you to express your feelings about yourself. You are to indicate your perceptions by placing an X on one of the lines between each pair of words. The closer you place an X to a word indicates the degree to which it represents your perceptions or feelings.

I AM

Cautious |___|___|___|___|___|___| Impulsive

Relaxed |___|___|___|___|___|___| Tense

Secure |___|___|___|___|___|___| Insecure

Mature |___|___|___|___|___|___| Immature

Happy |___|___|___|___|___|___| Sad

Friendly |___|___|___|___|___|___| Unfriendly

Opinions can be assessed by Likert-type scales written to solicit gradations of favorable or unfavorable responses which are about an issue under study (see Lemon 1973). For example, students in one study were asked to respond to an instrument designed to assess their own perceptions of their learning situation.

Sample Likert-Type Items:
DIRECTIONS: Indicate your opinion of the following statements by marking SA if you Strongly Agree; A if you Agree; U if you are Undecided; D if you Disagree; and SD if you Strongly Disagree.

A. My teacher is a good discussion leader.
SA A U D SD
B. My teacher lectures most of the time.
SA A U D SD
C. My teacher encourages outside reading.
SA A U D SD
D. My teacher's assignments seem to be worthwhile.
SA A U D SD
E. My teacher is fair and square.
SA A U D SD

A ranking format is also useful in survey research where major factors are known but their significance and import are not. "What are the 'best things' and 'worst things' that could happen to you in school?" was asked to students to obtain their perceptions of selected socio-psychological factors in their school environments. These factors include both positive and negative experiences, such as taking tests, getting good grades, losing friends, and having no homework (Smith and Woody 1980).

Students were asked to rank the following by placing a 1 beside the best or worst, a 2 beside the next best or worst, etc.

Sample Ranking Format:
BEST THINGS (EXAMPLE)

—Having friends
—Being a leader
—Teacher telling me I did a good job
—Getting good grades

WORST THINGS (EXAMPLE)

—Being injured
—Losing friends
—Failing a grade
—Taking a test

2. The questionnaire should be as brief as possible and easy to answer. Since the length of the questionnaire affects the percentage of returns, the instrument should be kept short by including only information essential to the study (Mouly, 1978).
3. Items concerning age, income, education and other semiprivate information can be encouraged by using brackets. Since these questions elicit information that is not often disclosed, brackets provide ranges to which most people are willing to respond. Questions should consider all possible answers and not include categories that overlap, e.g., Income: under $19,999 _____; $20,000 to $24,999 _____; $25,000 to $29,999 _____; over $30,000 _____ .
4. All questionnaires should include a brief introductory letter explaining the purpose of the research and the reason the respondent's answers are important. Also, if there is a long-range benefit to the respondent, it should be explained to encourage more thoughtful responses.
5. If the questionnaire is mailed, a stamped, self-addressed envelope will increase the number of returns. Follow-up letters are necessary to obtain more responses; a return of 70 percent compared to 40 percent allows the researcher to make more substantial conclusions regarding the findings (Warwich and Lininger 1975).

PILOT STUDY

Once the researcher decides upon the procedures and instrumentation, a pilot study is desirable to refine the overall research project.

One is called for if some of the research procedures are not clear or if the questionnaire or interview protocol is new. This trial run can provide valuable information to improve the overall study and save time and energy later. Instructions for responding to the instrumentation as well as the wording of specific questions can be improved through pilot studies, which should not be conducted with the same sample as the actual study (Mouly 1978).

In the study of students' perceptions of the best things and worst things that can happen at school, a pilot study helped to clarify the procedures for administering the questionnaire. The students selected for the study were intermediate age students. The pilot study showed that the comprehension level of some of the questions was too difficult, which could significantly affect the findings. Adjustments were made by having experienced intermediate-level teachers make vocabulary changes. The instruments were analyzed using a readibility formula and then finalized.

SUMMARY

Since survey research is a very flexible technique for obtaining information, attitudes and opinions, a variety of survey techniques can be used to accommodate inquiry into research questions. Surveys are used to gather information to describe the nature of existing conditions or relationships. The quality of the data generated by survey research is directly related to meaningful and reliable instrumentation as well as to the overall research design.

Areas of investigation for survey research can include curriculum and teaching issues, for example, concerning more effective ways of fostering learning. Surveys used to monitor teachers' and students' attitudes and opinions are important in establishing favorable working and learning conditions. Value and moral issues as well as controversial issues can be explored in social studies classrooms through the creative use of survey techniques.

Finally, as teachers themselves conduct surveys to answer research questions, they become creators rather than just consumers of knowledge. This spirit of inquiry can have a catalytic effect on students. Teachers conducting research may motivate their students to develop and implement research projects. The social studies can be examined through processes of inquiry, such as developing, conducting and analyzing survey information. The utilization of survey procedures provides a valuable skill for future citizens as well as social scientists.

REFERENCES

Beardslee, William, and John Mack. "The Impact on Children and Adolescents of Nuclear Developments." *Psychosocial Aspects of Nuclear Developments, Task Force Report 20.* Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association, December 1981.

Campbell, Donald. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research.* Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Cohen, Louis, and Lawrence Manion. *Research Methods in Education.* London: Croom Helm, 1980.

Gallup, George. *The Gallup Poll: Public Opinion, 1935–1971*. New York: Random House, 1972.

Goodlad, John. *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

Hunkins, Francis, Lee Ehman, Carole Hahn, Peter Martorella and Jan Tucker. *Review of Research in Social Studies Education: 1970–1975*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977.

Jessen, Raymond. *Statistical Survey Techniques*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.

Lemon, Nigel. *Attitudes and Their Measurement*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.

Lippitt, Ronald, Robert Fox and Lucille Schaible. *The Teacher's Role in Social Science Investigation*. Chicago: SRA, 1969.

McGaw, Dickinson, and George Watson. *Political and Social Inquiry*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1976.

Moser, Claus, and Graham Kalton. *Survey Methods in Social Investigation*. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Mouly, George. *Educational Research: The Art and Science of Investigation*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1978.

Newlove, B. W., and G. E. Hall. *A Manual for Assessing Open-Ended Statements of Concern about an Innovation*. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1976.

Osgood, Charles, George Suci and Percy Tannenbaum. *The Measurement of Meaning*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Richardson, Edward. *Research Techniques for the Social Sciences: Manual*. New York: International Universities Press, 1983.

Slavin, Robert. *Research Methods in Education: A Practical Guide*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1984.

Smith, Dennie. "Is In-Service Irrelevant?" *Educational Television* 3 (February 1971): 6, 34.

Smith, Dennie. "Personal Evaluation and Feedback." In *Handbook of Structured Experiences for Human Relations Training*, edited by John Pfeiffer and John Jones. LaJolla, CA: University Associates, 1977.

Smith, Dennie, and Lana Smith. "Concerns of Social Studies Educators." *Southern Regional Social Studies Quarterly* 10 (Spring 1984): 36–47.

Smith, Dennie, and Dennis Woody. "Affective Factors as Motivators in the Middle Grades." *Phi Delta Kappan* 62 (July 1980): 524–528.

Warwich, Donald, and Charles Lininger. *The Sample Survey: Theory and Practice*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Weisberg, Herbert, and Bruce Bowen. *An Introduction to Survey Research and Data Analysis*. San Francisco, CA: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1977.

CHAPTER 4

EXPERIMENTAL RESEARCH

Patrick Ferguson

Experimentation is a prominent and important part of our way of life. Robin Williams has explained that because we value progress, achievement and efficiency we are motivated to experiment with new, and what we hope will be improved means of attaining our goals. We may experiment with the ingredients of a recipe, try out a new tennis racquet, or change brands of gasoline as we endeavor to make our lives more efficient and rewarding (Williams 1966).

Social studies teachers reflect this penchant for experimentation when they try out new teaching techniques or experiment with novel instructional materials. The success or failure of these instructional "experiments" is usually determined on the basis of the teacher's intuitive judgment. While the value of intuitive assessment cannot be dismissed, the quality of judgment may be substantially improved through the use of a more formal approach to experimentation. This chapter describes how teachers may use the experimental model of research as a more rigorous means of assessing instructional methods in the social studies classroom.

To accomplish this, it is necessary to: (1) define experimentation, (2) see how it works in the science laboratory, (3) compare this ideal laboratory procedure with an example of experimental research in the classroom, and (4) review the criteria for judging the quality of experimental research projects. Then follows a discussion of the design of experimental studies and some ideas for using experimental research procedures in the social studies classroom.

WHAT IS AN EXPERIMENT?

So far the term "experiment" has been used to describe any circumstance in which there is an effort to try something new for the purpose of achieving a better result. While Webster would not object to this general and rather vague usage, formal experimentation requires a more precise definition.

Simply put, an experiment is a controlled project conducted for the purpose of establishing or testing a law or an effect. By controlled I mean that the experiment has been carefully planned and meticulously carried out.

AN EXAMPLE FROM THE WORLD OF SCIENCE

To illustrate, let us consider an experiment that might have been conducted to solve a hypothetical problem in the space shuttle program.

To set the stage for this experiment, imagine the NASA launching site at Cape Kennedy at dawn. A newly designed space shuttle is scheduled to be launched in 24 hours; however, the type of gas normally used to control certain critical functions of the shuttle is acting erratically under certain test conditions. NASA officials are considering substituting a new type of gas called "toxygon."

Unfortunately, not much is known about this new gas. Some of the NASA engineers have serious reservations because they are not sure what effect fluctuating temperatures in the shuttle will have on the pressure levels of toxygon. NASA officials contact a scientist at a nearby university, who agrees to work on the problem.

With only 24 hours to complete the experiment, our scientist promptly sets to work. She searches the scientific literature for reports of earlier experiments on toxygon. Although she finds no reported studies on toxygon itself, she discovers reports of experiments on temperature and pressure for similar types of gases. Based upon these previous experiments, she predicts that raising the temperature of toxygon will cause its pressure to increase at a constant rate.

Our scientist then prepares to conduct an experiment. After she assembles all the necessary paraphernalia, she insures that the laboratory environment is carefully controlled so that no outside or extraneous variables, such as laboratory temperature, light or sound, will affect the outcome of the experiment.

She begins by filling a standard container with a measured amount of toxygon, and then slowly raises the temperature of the container at regular intervals and records both the temperature and the corresponding pressure level for each temperature increment. As predicted, the results show a corresponding increase in pressure for each incremental rise in temperature. There is, however, one critical departure from her original prediction of a constant rise in pressure; beyond 100 degrees the pressure begins to increase at a very rapid rate—much faster than at lower temperature levels. Repeating the experiment several times produces the same results.

Upon completion of the experiment, she submits her report, containing a statement of her original prediction, a description of the methods used, the test data, the test results, and how these results led to the modification of the original prediction. As a result, the NASA officials conclude that the use of toxygon would be risky and decide to postpone the flight until a better solution can be found.

To briefly review the steps in this experiment:

1. A problem was defined in terms of the question: How will a change in X (temperature) affect Y (pressure)?
2. A specific prediction was made about the outcome of an experiment designed to test the effect of X on Y.
3. A step-by-step procedure was established for testing the prediction.
4. An effort was made to carefully control extraneous influences so that only the variable being manipulated would affect the outcome.
5. The data were collected through the use of instruments that accurately measured changes in the variables of interest.
6. The tests were repeated several times to confirm the results.
7. The original prediction was evaluated in light of the test results.
8. A report was published describing the procedures and findings of the experiment.

These eight steps outline the usual research procedure in the science laboratory. This same procedure is followed in the conduct of educational experiments.

AN EXAMPLE OF EXPERIMENTAL RESEARCH IN THE CLASSROOM

To see how the experimental approach is used in an educational setting, we move from the science laboratory to the classroom and examine an experiment designed to test the effectiveness of interdependent learning groups in 5th grade social studies classes. The interdependent group approach tested in this experiment is sometimes referred to as the "jigsaw method," devised by Elliot Aronson and his colleagues at the University of Texas as part of an experiment in applied social psychology conducted in the Austin, Texas, School District. In this approach:

1. The teacher divides the material for a lesson into five or six equal segments. For example, Abraham Lincoln's biography might be divided into six equal segments covering the time period from his birth until his assassination.
2. The class is arranged into groups of five or six, according to the number of segments, and each member of the group is given one segment of the biography. The students are instructed that they will teach their segment to the other members of the group.

3. The class is regrouped so that all the students having the same segment are together. For example, all of the students with the "Early Wilderness Years" are in one group, those with "The Prairie Years" in another, and so on.
4. The new groups discuss the material and devise plans for teaching their segment.
5. The students return to their original groups and teach their segment of the material to the other group members.
6. In the culminating activity (usually an examination in the earlier research), the students use the material learned from their peers to achieve a good grade or successfully carry out some activity. They are thus dependent upon one another and cannot succeed without the assistance of their fellow group members—hence the term "interdependent learning groups."

The following experiment is a variation of the jigsaw method. (For a more detailed description of the jigsaw method, see Aronson et al. 1978 and for suggestions on ways to use the jigsaw method in the social studies classroom, see Ferguson 1983).

A jigsaw classroom study using the eight-step procedure employed in the toxygon experiment follows.

1. The Problem

Although by 1975 the Austin, Texas, schools had been desegregated for some time, student interaction across ethnic boundaries was minimal. Minority students were experiencing difficulties with their academic work, and their self-concepts were poor when compared with students of the majority culture.

A research team from a nearby university was asked to investigate the problem. They visited classrooms, examined school records, interviewed school personnel, and reviewed the appropriate theory and research. An experiment was devised to test the influence of interdependent learning groups on interethnic attitudes and minority self-concepts.

2. Predictions (Hypotheses)

Earlier studies had reported success with group process activities under similar conditions. Using these findings, the researchers predicted that students taught through the interdependent learning groups (jigsaw method) would:

A. Manifest a greater liking for their own group members as compared to the rest of the class (Hypothesis 1);
B. Like school more than students in traditional classes (Hypothesis 2); and
C. Manifest higher self-esteem than students in traditional classes (Hypothesis 3).

3. Experimental Treatment

In preparing for the experiment, ten teachers who had volunteered to teach the interdependent experimental groups attended a workshop to learn about the jigsaw method. They were also trained in techniques for fostering cooperative learning in small peer-taught groups. Following this training period, 245 students in the ten volunteer teachers' classes studied social studies materials in interdependent (jigsaw) learning groups for three 50-minute periods a week over a six-week period. During the same six-week period, 59 students from 3 other classes were taught by the "traditional method," or the usual techniques of instruction employed by the teachers prior to the experiment.

4. Control of the Experiment

To control the experiment:

- An effort was made to select equally competent teachers to teach the interdependent and traditional groups (competent traditional teachers were recommended by the experimental teachers).
- The experiment was monitored so that both groups studied equivalent quantities of material over the same six-week period.
- Traditional teachers were selected from schools having experimental classes so that similar types of students would be in both the jigsaw and traditional groups.

5. Data Collection and Analysis

A questionnaire and a sociometric instrument were administered as pretests and posttests to assess changes in student attitudes over the six-week period. The statistical technique known as analysis of variance was used to analyze the data.

6. Replication of the Procedure

The experiment was conducted one time over a six-week period.

7. Findings

The predictions of a greater liking of ingroup members and improved self-esteem in the jigsaw classes were supported. However, only one group, the Anglos, increased their liking for school. Contrary to the expectations of the researchers, Mexican Americans increased their liking for school more in the traditional groups, and blacks actually decreased their liking for school in both groups. The researchers were not able to explain these unexpected findings, but advanced some hunches.

The data from two of the traditionally taught groups were discarded because reading disabilities invalidated questionnaire responses in one of the groups, and one of the traditional teachers inadvertently used cooperative group work in the other.

8. Report of the Research

The procedures and findings of the experiment were reported in the *Journal of Educational Research* (Blaney et al. 1977). The study has been referred to in subsequent literature on group process and the jigsaw method (Aronson et al. 1978; Slavin 1980).

Clearly, this research project was not as rigorously controlled as the toxygon experiment. Any one of a number of extraneous factors might have caused changes in the students attitudes in the jigsaw study, e.g., events in the students' lives outside of class, teachers' attitudes and biases, the influence of other school experiences. These were not controlled for in the study, nor were the variables in the educational study measured as precisely as in the laboratory study. In the toxygon investigation, changes in temperature and pressure were measured with precision instruments, but in the jigsaw study the variables were measured through the use of questionnaires. Finally, in the educational experiment, the changes in attitudes attributed to the instructional treatment had to be inferred since the effect of one variable upon another could not be directly observed as in the laboratory study.

The problem for educational researchers is that instructional experiments are usually carried out under existing school conditions and it is not possible to conform to the rigorous procedures and carefully controlled conditions of the laboratory. Nevertheless, we must judge the validity of any experimental investigation, whether it takes place in a school or in a science laboratory, according to the degree it conforms to the ideal requirements of the experimental procedures.

EVALUATING AN EDUCATIONAL EXPERIMENT

In their classic work on experimental research, Campbell and Stanley (1963) state that the worth of an educational experiment depends upon two factors: internal validity and external validity.

To determine the internal validity of a study, one must answer the question: How well were the extraneous variables controlled? Or, as Campbell and Stanley have put it, did in fact the experimental treatment make a difference in this specific experimental instance?

Clearly, the toxygon experiment had much greater internal validity than the jigsaw study, since the laboratory scientist was able to control all of the factors that might have affected the outcome of the experiment.

External validity is determined by answering the question: How generalizable (transferable) are the findings? That is, can the results of the experiment be transferred to other settings? In terms of external validity, questions may be raised about the generalizability of both investigations. Since the toxygon experiment was not conducted under actual flight conditions, it is not certain that the gas would behave on the space mission as it did in the laboratory. Similarly, because the jigsaw researchers had to use volunteer teachers and could not control the assignment of students, there is a question about the generalizability of their findings to the remaining 5th grade classrooms in the school system.

With reference to improving the validity of experimental studies, Borg and Gall (1979) have described an interesting dilemma. Should the researcher choose to introduce tighter controls to improve internal validity, it may be at the cost of maintaining a realistic educational environment, making it difficult to transfer the findings into practical field application.

Although it is not possible to list all of the questions one might ask when judging the validity of an experimental study, some of the more important ones are:

1. Did other events, extending over the time of the experiment, influence the outcome of the experiment?
2. Was the experimental treatment of sufficient amplitude and duration to have an effect?
3. Could the psychological or biological maturation of the subjects over the period of the experiment have affected the results?
4. Did the unique nature of the experiment create an effect due of the novelty of the treatment?
5. Did the subjects receive special treatment from the researcher causing what is known as the Hawthorne or placebo effect?
6. Did the experiment interfere with the usual routine to the extent that subjects were negatively affected by the disruption?
7. Were the hypotheses stated in terms of cause and effect, i.e., that a change in one variable (the independent variable) will cause a change in the other variable (the dependent variable)?
8. Were the variables measured by valid and reliable means?
9. Were the subjects randomly selected from a well-defined population?
10. Were the subjects randomly assigned to the experimental and control groups?
11. Was the sample large enough? If not, was the experiment replicated under identical conditions and with equivalent groups of subjects?
12. Could the pre- or posttest have influenced the experiment by sensitizing subjects to the experimental treatment or serving as a learning experience itself?

THE PROBLEM OF EXPERIMENTER BIAS

Another factor that may adversely affect the validity of an experiment is researcher bias. Campbell and Stanley have observed that for the typical, highly motivated researcher the nonconfirmation of a cherished hypothesis is painful (1963, p. 3). Robert Rosenthal has conducted many investigations into the problem of experimenter bias and demonstrated that researchers' hopes and expectations for the outcome of an experiment have been transmitted to subjects so as to affect the outcome of the investigation (Rosenthal 1966).

If the problem of experimenter bias is as widespread as Rosenthal's studies suggest, then we must examine research reports for signs of bias and take steps to insure that our own biases do not influence the outcomes of the studies we conduct.

DESIGNING EXPERIMENTS FOR THE SOCIAL STUDIES CLASSROOM

The design of an experiment simply refers to the plan for its execution. In their book on experimental methods, Campbell and Stanley (1963) describe 16 types of design. Although detailed presentation of these designs is beyond the scope of this chapter, it is possible to discuss the three main categories these designs are classified into: pre-experimental, true experimental, and quasi-experimental.

Each of these three types of design can be utilized in conducting a classroom experiment. Suppose we want to test the effectiveness of a new microcomputer tutorial designed to teach students about the judicial system in the United States. We would like to know if it is as effective as our usual method of teaching by lecture and recitation. We must decide what procedures we will use to conduct this investigation, that is, what sort of a design to utilize for our experiment. What are our options?

Pre-Experimental Design

The simplest approach is to have the students complete the tutorial and then test their knowledge. In other words, administer the experimental treatment to a single group of students and measure the outcome.

Unfortunately, opting for this commonly used method of assessing student performance means that we will sacrifice validity for the sake of simplicity and convenience. Validity is compromised because there is no way to determine the influence of the treatment on the posttest, and, since the students are tested only once, it is impossible to know whether the students' achievement improves over time.

We can improve this design by adding a step to our previous procedure; which is:

1. Administer a pretest to measure the students' knowledge.
2. Have the students work on the computer tutorial.
3. Administer a posttest measuring their knowledge again. By adding a

pretest we can measure change in knowledge over the period of the treatment, a definite improvement.

However, since no control group (a group not using the tutorial) is used for comparison, the experimenter can only assume that changes between the pretest and posttest were brought about by the experimental treatment rather than through the influence of other factors.

Many studies in education described as "experimental" use these methods but are, according to Campbell and Stanley, more accurately described as pre-experimental or even nonexperimental because of their extremely poor internal and external validity.

To maximize the validity of our investigation, we will have to consider using what Campbell and Stanley call a "true experimental design."

True Experimental Design

To implement a true experiment we would have to use the following procedure:

1. Randomly assign the students in our U.S. government classes to two groups.
2. Administer a pretest to both groups.
3. Have one group (the experimental group) study the judicial system through the use of the computer tutor, and have the second group (the control group) learn about the judicial system through the usual method of instruction.
4. Give both groups a posttest and compare the results.

In true experimental designs, at least two equivalent groups of subjects are employed in the study. The experiences of the two groups are kept as identical as possible with the exception that the experimental group is exposed to the treatment. The key to this approach is the random assignment of subjects to the groups and careful control of any extraneous variables that might affect the outcome of the experiment. This type of design has the greatest potential for producing valid results.

Quasi-Experimental Design

If it is not possible to randomly assign students to the two groups, the best strategy is to identify two nearly identical classes of students and designate one as the experimental group and the other as the control group. If there are five U.S. government classes, we might select the two classes that most closely match in terms of learning ability and motivation. Except for this variation in selection of subjects, the procedure described under the true experimental design should be followed.

In classroom investigations, it is not usually possible to randomly assign subjects to the experimental and control groups. Yet, according to Campbell and Stanley, it is still possible to conduct an experiment having adequate internal and external validity even though the experimenter does not have full control over the experiment. However, the researcher must be aware of the limitations and problems that may arise when subjects are not randomly assigned. There is disagreement as to the legitimacy of quasi-experimental studies even when they have been closely monitored. The validity of each study must be judged according to the criteria stated earlier in the section on evaluating experimental investigations.

In summary, if you are considering conducting an experiment, you should make every effort to conduct a true experiment. If this is not possible, then your next best bet is to conduct a tightly controlled quasi-experiment. Experimentalists recommend that you not reduce your efforts to a pre-experimental approach. If for some reason this is necessary, you can salvage some validity by using the pretest-posttest approach. Experimental researchers would not recommend the use of one-group, posttest method as a valid design for an experimental study.

CONCLUSION

Although it has been possible to provide only an overview of experimental research, it is hoped that this introduction will encourage teachers to expand upon and improve their methods of evaluation, if not to conduct legitimate experimental investigations of their own. For further information on experimental research procedures, the books by Isaac and Michael (1977) and Borg and Gall (1979) are readable and informative.

One way to start is to scan the literature for studies that can be replicated in your own school. Even if full-fledged replication is not feasible, the treatments used in these studies often represent new and interesting teaching methods that can be "experimented" with in the looser sense of the term. The jigsaw method referred to earlier is an example (Aronson et al. 1978; Ferguson 1983).

Before closing, it should be mentioned that the application of the experimental method to the problems of education has been questioned by some scholars. After reading this article, it might be profitable to return to the Popkewitz chapter on paradigms and promises to put experimentalism into perspective. You may or may not come to believe, as Campbell and Stanley do, in the experiment

> as the only means for settling disputes regarding educational practice, as the only way of verifying educational improvements and as the only way of establishing a cumulative tradition in which improvements can be introduced without the danger of fadish discard of old wisdom in

favor of inferior novelties. (1963, p. 2)

Regardless, a knowledge of the procedures of formal experimentation can help us gain insight into the legitimacy of the means used to acquire knowledge about the effects of what transpires in the social studies classroom.

REFERENCES

Aronson, Elliot, Nancy T. Blaney, Cookie Stephan, Jev Sikes and Matthew Snapp. *The Jigsaw Classroom.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1978.

Blaney, Nancy T., Cookie Stephan, David Rosenfield, Elliot Aronson and Jev Sikes. "Interdependence in the Classroom: A Field Study." *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 69 (1977):121–128.

Borg, Walter R., and Meredith D. Gall. *Educational Research. An Introduction.* New York: Longman, 1979.

Campbell, Donald T., and Julian C. Stanley. *Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs for Research.* Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1963.

Ferguson, Patrick. "Aronson's Jigsaw: A Research Method and Teaching Technique." *Social Studies Teacher,* 4 (February–March 1983):4.

Isaac, Stephan, and William B. Michael. *Handbook in Research and Evaluation.* San Diego, CA: Edits Publishers, 1977.

Luckman, G. William, David Rosenfield, Elliot Aronson and Jev Sikes. "Performance in the Interdependent Classroom: A Field Study." *American Educational Research Journal,* 13 (Spring 1976):115–123.

Rosenthal, Robert. *Experimenter Effects in Behavioral Research.* New York: Appleton Century Crofts, 1966.

Slavin, Robert E. "Cooperative Learning." *Review of Educational Research,* 50 (1980):315–342.

Williams, Robin M. "Values Orientation in American Society." In *American Society.* New York: Knopf, 1966.

Chapter 5

AN ETHNOGRAPHIC APPROACH

Jane J. White

It is 10:15 on a Tuesday morning in May, and the air is already heavy and still. There is less than a month to go until school is out, and the 6th graders are lethargic and barely moving. The bare grimy bulletin boards indicate that the final cleaning out of the classrooms has begun; stray papers escape from the lockers that line the institutional cream and green cement block halls. Outside, unsuccessfully painted-over graffiti on one side of the school building adds to the already shabby appearance of the neighborhood with its small square white frame houses. Once pristine and the pride of their owners, their peeling paint and untended yards are just another indication of the lingering recession at the nearby docks and steel mills.

Because of the heat, the 6th graders have been invited to the front of the classroom where they sprawl on the rug near several open windows waiting for the breeze that never comes.

> **Ms. T.:** All right then, we come to the Decline of Athens on page 41. And it goes on to page (pause) let's see, page 43. Remember, we talked before about the Delian League. Does anybody remember what the Delian League was from your reading?

No eye contact is made with the teacher as the students listlessly glance at their textbooks.

> **Ms. T.:** (in a mildly fussing tone) The same hands are up. There should be other hands participating. Bernie and Steven are the only two who did any reading?

She directs the class to reread pages 42 and 43 "very silently" to see how Athens eventually got control of the Delian League. The room is quiet except for the scuffling of a few students who wander over to the sink to get drinks of lukewarm water.

The teacher surveys the students. She notices that Eric is not following directions. He doesn't even have his book open.

Ms. T.: Eric, I want to see you reading.
Ms. T.: (more loudly) Eric.
Eric: (looks over at teacher with a smile and says very sweetly) Ms. T., what did you say?
Ms. T.: I want to see you reading those two pages.
Eric: What two pages?
Ms. T.: 42 and 43.
Eric: 32 and 53?
Ms. T.: 42 and 43! (with exasperation) Do you want to read that now?

After waiting for a few more minutes, the teacher tries again to involve the students in the social studies lesson. She begins to ask a series of recall questions based directly on the information in the textbook. She checks up on Eric to see if he has done the reading. Ms. T. asks very simple who, what and why questions hoping to involve more students than just Bernie and Steven, who have their hands up again.

Less than ten minutes have passed, but it is already obvious that Ms. T. is embedded in a dilemma all too familiar to social studies practitioners. I imagine that many of us experienced an inward groan of recognition: the hot day, the end of the school year, 6th graders who are getting ready to graduate, students who don't seem to remember what they read the day before.

Yet ethnographic research can provide a structure to study the everyday, commonplace dilemmas that are central to all teachers. Using this 6th grade social studies lesson on ancient Greece, I will show that an ethnographic approach furnishes explanations of what is happening within classrooms unavailable in more traditional research paradigms. Ethnographic research can provide both a wide-angle and a close-up lens, enabling us to "see" and begin to make sense of the complex, uncertain problems that we confront as practitioners. Whereas other forms of research try to take apart the complexity of classroom life and examine segments in isolation from one another in order to understand them, ethnographers try to put together the patterns that make up and are made up by the whole.

The value of ethnographic research for teachers lies not in providing another set of laboratory-tested techniques currently touted as the only productive, effective way of teaching. Rather, the value of ethnography is that it provides a new way of thinking about and framing areas in our practice that frustrate and confound us. Ethnographic research is useful because it describes the meanings of classroom events from the perspectives of both teachers and students.

THE ETHNOGRAPHIC APPROACH

Culture as a Perceptual Frame: Thinking Holistically

Ethnographers use the metaphor of culture as a holistic way of thinking about what is happening in schools. But what is culture and how does it relate to the study of classrooms?

Culture is the way of life developed over time by a group as they adapt to an environment. Culture is shared by members of a group and it is complex. Keesing and Keesing (1971, p. 20) say that a culture "refers to those socially transmitted patterns for behavior characteristic of a particular social group." They also define culture as "the organized system of knowledge whereby a people structure their experience and perceptions, formulate acts and choose between alternatives."

Culture is both explicit and implicit. Hall (1973) has written about the silent invisible nature of culture. For example, a culture includes sets of standards for what types of social relationships to establish with different types of people; how to use space (how close one should stand to another person); how to use time; what work is; what play is; how a male acts and looks; what a female is; how and when to talk to people and about what. The specialized language of a group is an especially rich cultural system for investigation.

Each culture is seen as a unique, self-contained system or systems that must be studied holistically. Specific behaviors and beliefs are studied in terms of how they are interrelated and function within the context of the whole. Therefore patterns of practices and beliefs are not studied as if they had meanings apart from the group of people who generate them.

Assuming that a community, school or classroom is a self-sustaining culture and that the behaviors and knowledge that teachers and students display are culturally organized, educational anthropologists try to describe recurring patterns of behavior and the social contexts in which they are constructed. Social interactions, such as conversations and lessons, are perceived as social products generated by "moves" made by the participants (Magoon 1977; Mehan 1982).

Ethnographers assume that there is inherent order and regularity in people's way of life and that the purpose of the ethnographer is to describe how the participants make sense out of their ongoing stream of behavior and events. The task of the ethnographer is to temporarily suspend judgment and knowledge owned as a member of his or her particular culture and to try to understand life as an insider. Contrary to popular opinion, even seemingly chaotic ways of life, such as that of the low reading group, make sense to their members and have order and regularity (McDermott 1976). These insights into the insiders' social logic are then written in narrative form by an ethnographer so that outsiders can understand the structure and function of the practices and beliefs.

Educational ethnography has emerged as a competing research paradigm in the last fifteen years. It differs in several fundamental ways from a more traditional form of educational research based on psychology. First, since ethnographers try not to impose their preconceived ideas onto the scene when studying a way of life, they do not start out with hypotheses or any other a priori set of categories or coding systems.

Then, since they try to frame what they are studying holistically, they do not start by defining and operationalizing variables; focusing on discrete particles of behavior is seen as pulling them out of context. Studying a culture is more like focusing on the field rather than focusing on a particle (Young, Becker and Pike 1970). Also, ethnographers do not partition educational events into traditional educational categories. For example, social knowledge, intentionality, emotions and values are all assumed to be displayed in people's interactions: events and meanings are not split unnaturally into cognitive, affective or psychomotor domains.

Second, ethnographic inquiry is inductive. Ethnographic descriptions are considered to be rich, valid and situation specific. The researcher is studying a specific group of people in a specific environment and at a specific time and place that is unique. The findings could never be replicated exactly. The significance of the description lies in the fact that the recurring patterns of behavior and belief can be inductively compared to descriptions from other similar contexts so that midlevel theories of similarities, differences and variability can be generated.

The Inductive Gathering and Analysis of Data

Since ethnographers do not begin with discretely operationalized variables and a hypothesis, and since they do not initially focus their question much beyond the standard ethnographic question, "What is happening?" deciding what data to start gathering is difficult. It is even more difficult to know how to organize and reference data as they are being collected. There are no easy formulas for when to stop collecting data, for judging how much data is enough or for knowing what to do with all the collected information. Given that ethnographic inquiry uses a holistic approach, one of the greatest difficulties is deciding what, exactly, is significant.

Ethnographers begin by immersing themselves totally in the daily life of a group. They systematically gather concrete data about ordinary events and try to identify the normal range of typical daily occurrences. Ethnographers gather data from many sources, although taking copious field notes while observing or participating in ongoing events is still the time-honored favorite. A partial list might include mapping, charting, informal and formal interviews, and "collecting life histories; studying written documents relevant to the history of the group; and recording folklore of all types—narratives, songs, myths, riddles, rhymes and proverbs" (Heath 1982, p. 34). Verbal and nonverbal communication is frequently audio- or videotaped, and documents and artifacts and how they are used are analyzed. From this mass of data, ethnographers organize their descriptions by selecting key incidents which typify patterns of interaction.

Patterns may first be picked up in field notes through an awareness of repetition and by internal comparison. For example, from the notes and tape of a lesson, an ethnographer may notice a contrast between two tones of voice being used by a teacher and a subsequent difference in reactions by the students. The teacher may use a sweet, polite voice to make requests that the students ignore. She may then issue a command in a fierce tone—with overtones of "do it or else!"—that the students comply with immediately. The contexts in which these patterns were characteristically generated, the patterns themselves and the subsequent events can be internally contrasted and described.

Patterns may also be perceived by the discovery of discrepancies: incongruities between what a researcher or an informant logically expects to have happen as opposed to systematic notes about what actually did happen. There may be incongruities between what different groups like teachers and students perceived as actually occurring. Many of the questions that finally become hypotheses in a study are based on discrepancies that were discovered during data gathering. For example, McDermott and Gospodinoff (1979) wanted to find out, given all the time and emphasis placed on reading instruction in elementary classrooms, how it is possible for a student *not* to learn how to read.

At various points in the data collection, ethnographers sharpen and refine their focus on a theme within the culture. Eventually they develop one or more hypotheses out of the ongoing analysis of their field notes. At some point during the analysis, the balance shifts so that ethnographers work in the field to test and validate constructs that they think they have discerned rather than continuing to collect additional but less focused data.

During inductive inference, nonexamples are actively sought so as to test and refine one's emerging categories. Malinowski argues that if a researcher "is incapable of changing his views constantly and casting them off ungrudgingly under the pressure of evidence, needless to say his work will be worthless" (1966, p. 9). Internal validity is sought by the process of triangulation. This means that a researcher tries to confirm a cultural pattern inferred from one type of data by finding evidence of it in additional, different sources. For example, if a teacher, the students and the parents all spontaneously and independently refer to a belief or an event as significant (even though they may have very different reactions to it), the researcher can be reasonably certain that something is occurring that the three different types of participants are responding to and making meaning out of.

Throughout the later stages of the data gathering and analysis, ethnographers begin writing drafts describing various patterns in the way of life of the people studied. Gaps and contradictions inspire additional trips to the site for further data gathering to flesh out and refine the final account of what is happening.

Ethnographers are concerned with the relations of the parts to the whole. Using what Erickson (1977) calls "leaps of inference," ethnographers relate key events to other events and to a larger structure or model. Erickson has said that an ethnographic description should be written "so that others can see the generic in the particular, the universal in the concrete, the relation between part and whole" (1977, p. 61). This process of identifying recurring patterns that are shaped within a context and of linking significant events to a functional model distinguishes ethnographic description from a series of anecdotes.

Ethnographic research reports are written as narrative descriptions. One indication of their validity is their ability to invoke a sense of authenticity. The reader should feel a sense of familiarity with the dynamics of the situation being described. We react to their descriptive power and richness with an "Aha!" as if we have been there before. Ethnographies are not normative recipes or a list of the ten things that one *should* do to have a better school or classroom. Rather, ethnographies are intended to be used as mirrors for social studies educators to hold up to themselves as they compare their own practices to practices described in the studies; social studies educators can then reflect upon the similarities and differences that they see.

ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY OF CONSTRUCTING KNOWLEDGE ABOUT DIFFERENT CULTURES

The transcript of a 6th grade lesson about ancient Greece was just a small part of an ethnographic study that I conducted in an elementary school (White 1980) to find out how teachers and students constructed knowledge about different cultures. Over a period of four years, I gathered many types of data about K-6 social studies lessons.

I read and analyzed documents including all the county social studies guides published in the last 20 years, social studies grade-level annual plans, lesson plans, textbooks, students' social studies notebooks and written work, and the monthly newsletters sent home from the principals to the parents.

During the years 1976 to 1979, I observed and took notes on more than 180 lessons in all subjects at all grade levels. Thirty-six social studies lessons were audiotaped, transcribed, and analyzed. These lessons ranged from single lessons on Indians in kindergarten to units including "Our Friends Around the World" (1st grade), "Japan" (4th grade), and "South America" and "Ancient Greece" (6th grade). Rooms were mapped, bulletin boards photographed, and artifacts analyzed.

I was a participant as well as an observer since I was occasionally invited to teach "special" anthropological social studies lessons. I also supervised several student teachers who were placed there every other semester. During the last few weeks of two school years I formally interviewed the teachers and groups of students in each grade about what they had taught or learned in social studies that year.

As seen in the introductory episode, ordinary details about everyday life in the classroom were systematically recorded (simultaneously through field notes and by audiotaping) and analyzed. Small, particular incidents such as the initial encounter between Ms. T. and Eric and patterns of asking and answering questions had been noted again and again so they were known to be characteristic and within the normal range of interaction and instruction for this class. Being "scientific" did not mean ruthlessly ignoring the emotions and intentionality of the participants. For example, from descriptions of body language in my field notes, I inferred aspects of social relationships between the teachers and students: sprawling on the floor listlessly indicated student apathy; angry little sniffs indicated annoyance on the part of the teacher.

But what was I to do next? Encumbered with file drawers of field notes and transcripts, how was I to select what is significant from the entire mass? And how could it ever be relevant or useful to anyone else? My problem was to discover a problem. My attempts to think like an ethnographer are reflected in the following discussion of that first episode.

STATUS INEQUITY AS A CONTEXT FOR LEARNING

At the beginning of this lesson on ancient Greece, the status inequity between Ms. T. and the 6th graders is obvious. Society has assigned her the dominant role as the teacher because of adult status, greater academic knowledge and greater social competence. But how does this status inequity affect the teaching and learning of academic knowledge? How do the social interactions between the teacher and students within this context shape their joint production and display of information about ancient Greece?

Face to face spoken communication always conveys more than the literal meaning of the words spoken. Instructional utterances carry information about the relationships between the participants as well as the actual content of the message. Bateson (1972, p. 367) even argues that "Discourse is primarily about the rules and contingencies of relationships." He claims that every relationship is based on status inequities and that this provides a structure that constrains what each of the participants can say or do.

Teachers establish their power through institutionalized forms of classroom communication. The most prevalent form of classroom discourse is the teacher question-student response-teacher reaction format as described by Bellack, Hyman, Smith and Kliebard (1966) and Mehan (1979). A common way of organizing attention and turn-taking, this instructional cycle functions to form a context in which specific types of knowledge are required in order to "fill in the slots" or turns and thus keep the interactions flowing.

The basic means teachers use to bid for power is The Question. Teachers achieve their situational dominance through conscious and unconscious manipulation of the dual message-channels of the question. While producing an utterance that carries academic information, they are simultaneously transmitting claims about their control over the teacher-pupil relationship.

Asking a control question establishes one's superiority in a relationship. By initiating this lesson with a question, "Does anybody remember what the Delian League was from your reading?" Ms. T. is asserting her power to control. The use of a controlling question establishes a classroom context that in its most extreme form is similar to an interrogation, inquisition or trial by ordeal. The relationship set up is one of dependence in which the supplicant tries to please the examiner with the correct answer. Questions are used to test and challenge students and to hold them accountable (Goody 1978).

The students do not respond to Ms. T.'s opening question. Either they don't recall the answer or else they are not participating. Only two hands go up.

The teacher gives a call for increased participation. She gives straight, bald-faced directives for what to do. There is no masking of her power as the external authority and, in this case, as the slightly disapproving adult. She notes: "The same hands are up. There should be other hands (rather than people) participating." Ms. T. then personalizes and gives a direct, shaming challenge: "Bernie and Steven are the only two who did any reading?"

Ms. T. uses pauses, but there are no bids by students to display knowledge. Since the knowledge construction consists only of the teacher talking to herself, there is a danger that the lesson will not work due to lack of student interest. Ms. T. cleverly does not invoke the dread possibility of resistance, albeit passive resistance, by the students. Instead she publicly attributes their lack of response to ignorance. She exerts her authority by adding a "very silently" to her pseudo-question, "How about you people reading very silently now pages 42 and 43 so you'll remember a little more about the Delian League and see how Athens eventually got control of the Delian League?—42 to 43." Ms. T. has also given an academic reason for the students to read.

The textbook can seem a valuable tool given the constraints that the teacher must adapt to: she has a short amount of time in which she must cover much information about ancient Greece and she must present it to 32 individuals. The use of the textbook is optimal for performing several functions—first of all it can be used to show a carefully sequenced linear stream of public knowledge that is accessible to all. The textbook simultaneously functions to help the teacher maintain control. Ms. T. uses it to focus the attention of a room full of individuals: all students are to look at page 42. Any off-task students can be easily noticed and immediately corrected by redirecting their eye gaze.

Some students may have difficulty with a participation structure in which great status inequities exist. For example, Eric seems to have trouble buying into the framework of social relationships: he resists the teacher's bid to command him to read by having a "temporary attack of deafness" and just not being able to figure out which pages are required. Sometimes certain students are not able to acquire or display academic knowledge because they cannot accept or submit to the status inequity structure in which it is framed. Within the framework of this particular participant structure, students who know the answers must be willing to submit to the teacher as authority if they wish to display their information.

From their point of view, students may be damned if they do answer a teacher's question and damned if they don't. When they have strong ties to a peer group and the power differential between the student and teacher is great, if they publicly give a correct answer, they will be helping the teacher accomplish her instructional agenda. They may also be showing up the rest of the students who would not or could not answer. The public nature of the forum also provides another dilemma; students are liable to severe loss of face if their answer is wrong. From their perspective, it may be better just not to participate.

In the initial vignette, Ms. T. launched the lesson as if it were a typical "directed" reading lesson so prevalent in schools today. When she could not obtain sufficient participation, she may have reasonably assumed at first that the questions she was asking were too difficult. Therefore, she intuitively and logically kept reducing the difficulty, making the questions easier until, towards the end of the sequence, questions requiring short answers very similar to "fill in the blank" were being asked. McNeil (1984) observed high school economic teachers "deskilling" as a response to students who did not participate. She describes how teachers would react by lowering their expectations of the students and continually reducing the content of lessons. Finally the teachers were not utilizing their personal knowledge of the subject matter and in some cases were even contradicting it just to keep the lesson going.

Ms. T.'s authority in this particular situation may be threatened. The status inequity is perilous. Waller (1932, p. 10) has described the authority of the teacher as

> a despotism in a state of perilous equilibrium. It is a despotism threatened from within and exposed to regulation and interference from without. It is a despotism capable of being overturned in a moment, exposed to the instant loss of its stability and its prestige.

The use of the directed reading lesson relies heavily on assumptions that students will both want to and be able to quickly produce many "right" answers so that the intended work of the lesson can be accomplished. Problems develop when students cannot or will not participate. Ms. T. is in danger of not accomplishing her agenda due to lack of interest and participation by the students. She is on the verge of giving what Rosenfeld (1976) called a "phantom performance," in which the teacher takes on both roles, asking the questions and then answering them herself while pretending that the class is "with her." Ms. T. may be momentarily "stuck," and her performance is "in a state of perilous equilibrium." She may not know how to go further using this particular framework of social relationships. But teachers are problem solvers.

THE SECOND EPISODE

At this point, there has been minimal engagement and involvement between the students and teacher in what needs to be a mutual sharing of knowledge about ancient Greece. Only the two boys, Bernie and Steven, have participated, and many of the students look even sleepier, if that is possible, than when they began the lesson. Several students have managed to quietly readjust their position from sitting to lying on the rug to lying under several desks so that they're out of the line of sight of the teacher.

Ms. T. issues a face-saving explanation and then a direct threat:

Ms. T.: All right. (pause) Why did Athens gain control of the Delian League? And they did, they gained control of it. Why, what happened? Karen.

Karen: (no answer)

Ms. T.: Come on. We've got too many sleepyheads. I know you've only got a few more days before school ends. I still put grades down for these days, people.

However, even the grim specter of poor grades has lost potency and does not interject energy into the overwhelming indifference.

Without changing the pacing of the questions or the tone of her voice, Ms. T. then moves from asking who, what, where and why questions about the Athenians to asking "How would you feel. . . ?" and "What would happen if. . . ?" questions.

Ms. T.: Remember . . . that the other city-states had to have Athens' permission to sail or to trade.

Boy: Right so they. . . ,

Ms. T.: How would you feel if you were living in a city-state and you had to ask these people way across somewhere else their permission if you could sail your boat to, say, go trade with someone else? How would you feel if you were like that?

Boy: I wouldn't want it.

Ms. T.: What would happen if you were from the city-state of Melos or Sardis? How would you feel if you had to go to Athens to ask for their permission: "Um, Pericles, may we sail today for trade?"

Boy: Not really.

Ms. T.: Dennis, how would you feel?

Dennis: Not good.

As Ms. T. is asking these questions, more students sit up, begin to look interested and begin to raise their hands.

Ms. T.: Remember the Greeks believed in what? (pause)

Boy: Gods.

Ms. T.: Yeah, they believed in many gods. What else did they believe in at the moment?

Boy: Freedom

Ms. T.: Freedom, certain amount of freedom. Which ones had freedom?

Boy: Um, the rich ones.

Ms. T.: The rich ones, the rich ones who owned (pause) land. The rich ones who owned land, the ones who believed so much in this freedom. Now here we have the rich ones in the city-states. Now they had to go and beg Athens if they could go sailing or trade. Now how would they feel if they are supposed to be free? Bill.

Bill: They'll feel like they weren't free. They weren't free because they had to go ask somebody else.

Ms. T.: O.K. All right, instead of being free, they were becoming what?

Boy: Slaves.

Ms. T.: They were becoming slaves, very good. All right that's what was happening to them. What else would happen to them if they see Athens getting all this control and finally all this wealth and glory? How would you feel if you were one of these other city-states about Athens?

The air of lethargy is gone. Students are waving their hands to be called on, actively attending to what each other is saying, and talking louder, longer, more quickly.

Boy: You'd want to break away. You want to be free and you'd want to have kids. Every person has a dream and he wants to fulfill that dream and you can't do that with Athens.

Ms. T.: O.K.

Boy: Couldn't all the other city-states go against Athens?

Boy: Yeah

Ms. T.: Well, that's what we're going to find out if you want.

Boy: They did. Look at Pericles.

Ms. T.: That was the Pelopennesian Wars. That's what we're coming up to right now on page 43. Barry.

Barry: Like, who like Pericles, who was ruler after he wasn't?

Ms. T.: I don't remember. They had a whole series of rulers after Pericles but none of them was as strong as Pericles.

Boy: Well, um, when you're like a ruler like that, are you like a president and everything, or are you just a ruler?

Ms. T.: No, you're sort of like a president. You have certain things that you're allowed to do. But the Assembly has to vote on certain things that he commands. Like a president has, Congress has to vote on certain things that the president has to do. It's the same thing with Pericles and the Assembly. All right?

Boy: He was their greatest ruler.

Boy: What, did he die in battle or something?

Ms. T.: Well, we're going to find out later on why he died and how he died. What I want you to do is read page 43 where it starts saying Greek against Greeks. That's the part about the other people in the other city-states who are getting upset with Athens. I want you to read, uh, till page 44. Don't start reading the "Mistakes of Athenian Democracy." Just stop there. O.K.?

Reflecting upon this transcribed lesson so far, we see that the teacher and students have generated two very different episodes. After Ms. T. asks the series of "How would you feel if" questions, the participation structure and the nature of the knowledge being constructed about ancient Greece changes. The roles, status and power of the participants have shifted to a different interactional form. The overall tone of the communications including the students' body alignments, postures and gestures look different.

The participant structure changes because the status inequity between the teacher and the students has become less severe. This "sharing" of power has happened concomitantly with a shift in the type of knowledge that is being sought. Rather than continuing to ask a series of questions in which the teacher acts as if she already knows or "owns" the answers, the teacher is now asking open-ended questions in which only the student being addressed has the information being requested. Only the respondent can answer how he or she would feel if he or she lived in one of the Greek city-states that Athens was trying to dominate. There is no one "right" answer and thus the teacher is no longer the absolute arbiter of right and wrong. In fact, there may be many different appropriate responses and indeed, a discourse pattern develops in which Ms. T. asks the same question several times and receives several responses.

This open-ended type of question in which the questioner shares ownership and control of the flow of information with other participants elicits a structural shift in the meaning-making. Rather than not answering or answering just to displease or to please the teacher, the students can pursue their own ideas based on their own sense of what is interesting or satisfying.

One student generates a lengthy, thoughtful answer, in which he makes a claim about the meaning of freedom as the right to have a dream that can be fulfilled. He is making connections to his own personal knowledge and his own set of core values. We can see that this segment of the lesson is a mutual construction rather than an adult interpretation imposed on children. Both teacher and students use the word "freedom," act as if it is valued highly, and are eager to talk about it. Yet the term used by the 6th graders defines a particularly 6th grade or nonadult meaning. For example, having freedom means "not having someone else tell you what to do." Being free means "breaking away," "being able to have kids" and "having a dream."

Then, students, acting as if they were members of subjugated Ionian city-states, react to their situation by proposing options. For the first time, students instead of the teacher initiate questions: "Couldn't all the other city-states go against Athens?" The students and teacher begin a mutual inquiry, with a concurrent role shift in power and status in which they act as if they are equals working together to solve a common problem.

In this episode, there has been a shift in the students' commitment: they proceed as if they want to acquire knowledge about ancient Greece. The students talk to and answer each other. They use the teacher as a source of knowledge when she has it. However, when it seems as if she is putting them off, saying "Well, that is what we're going to find out if you want," they continue to learn in spite of her by answering each other's questions, e.g., "They did [go against Athens]. Look at Pericles."

There even seems to have been a shift in the amount of factual knowledge retained from the textbook. Students who moments before were unable or unwilling to answer very simple "What is a city-state?" type of questions are now citing Pericles as part of the answer to "What happened next?" in a historical story, complete with heros and a plot line that they seem to be jointly working out. The students pursue their line of inquiry by asking a series of five connected questions about Pericles, his successor, the extent of his power and his final fate.

It is significant to note that the students formulate their questions about the ancient Greek way of life based on their knowledge of our own cultural patterns. For example, when a student wants clarification and elaboration of the teacher's claim that Pericles was a "strong" ruler, he asks, "When you're like a ruler . . . , are you like a president and everything or are you just a ruler?" Ms. T. explains in the same mode by using analogies. Knowledge about the way of life in ancient Greece is acquired though asking questions and giving answers based on reference to the U.S. political system. This instructional episode is characterized by the number of "contextualizing" moves in which the students seek or the teacher provides explicit analogies and connections between the students' internal personal values, their own society's governmental structure and the other society's values and way of life.

This sequence of meaning-making ends when the teacher will not entertain any more of the student initiated statements and questions about Pericles. She refocuses attention back to academic knowledge as provided and owned by the textbook. The teacher may feel that she is more in control of the sequencing, pacing and organization of the flow of information if she and the students follow the order in the textbook. It may seem that the lesson goes "all over the place" when the students play such an active role in the discussion.

This teacher's move could also be described from the students' point of view as a rejection of their agenda for obtaining knowledge about Athens and Pericles in a way that makes sense to them. With Ms. T.'s redirection back to the book and claims that the knowledge they sought would be found within its covers at some future date, the students (particularly a group of boys including Eric who had been most active in this episode) lowered their hands with some audible sighs and slumped back into rather ho-hum postures as they flipped over to the next page.

For the rest of the lesson, the traditional textbook recitation pattern reigned supreme. A few students played with diverting the topic and sabotaging the lesson. For example, one boy innocently raised his hand and announced to the teacher, appropos of nothing:

Boy: You know what? If you drop a rat off the Empire State Building, it'll get up and run away.

Ms. T.: I don't know. I've never done that.

Boy: If you flush a rat down the toilet, it'll come right back up. (Students giggle.) This, there's so many weird things a rat can do.

Ms. T.: (sarcastically) That'd be interesting now. Everybody goes home today and takes a rat and sees if they can flush it down the toilet. (Students laugh and make comments.)

Robin: Take a gerbil.

Ms. T.: All right we've had enough of Pericles. He was the greatest ruler they ever had in Athens. Uh, let's get under control now. Come on. What happened after he died?

Other sequences of textbook recitation were briefly interrupted by socially inappropriate acts:

Ms. T.: Did the Athenians vote? Did they select a president wisely or did they do it unwisely? What happened?

Boy: (Belches loudly.)
Ms. T.: Many things happened. . . . Somebody apologize. Excuse themselves.
Boy: Huh?
Ms. T.: Excuse yourself.
Boy: (In dramatic tones.) Excuse me!

The teacher looked over towards me as she pushed her hair back from across her brow where it had fallen. It certainly was hot today. She and the students were getting tired. She assigned one more section to read, enjoying the silence of a class where everyone was on-task and working. After all, no teacher could realistically expect to accomplish too much so near the end of the school year.

INTERPRETING THE INTERPRETATION

One important aspect of ethnographic interpretation is that it is not evaluative or judgmental. Energy is not wasted on immediate rushes to premature judgment. Too often practitioners and supervisors react initially by focusing on what a teacher should or should not be doing. For example, an initial reaction to reading the first episode might be, depending on your values, "Oh, Ms. T. is such a *bad*, mediocre or ineffective teacher." Reading the second episode alone and out of context might leave one raving about what an excellent, inquiry oriented, dynamic teacher Ms. T. is. A lone viewing of the third episode of the lesson might leave one horrified and feeling that that woman had no place being in the classroom. Observers unfamiliar with the creative ways of 6th graders might be shocked, unaware that that kind of exchange ever went on in school. Experienced old hands, however, might justifiably use those exchanges about the rat and the belch after the return to the textbook as evidence that students always get out of control when you try something like discussion. They could make a good case that Ms. T.'s biggest error was to leave the textbook at all to entertain any of the student questions: if you don't keep the lid on at all times, you get what you ask for.

Whether Ms. T. is a good or bad teacher, effective or not is not the main issue of this analysis. Immediate concern with pronouncing her effective or ineffective closes off thoughtful reflection and learning about what is happening with the students and teacher during the lesson. Ethnographic researchers are much more like naturalists. They go out into the field to systematically take accurate notes on what is actually happening. Lorenz (1952), for example, did not begin his study of geese with predetermined notions of how a good goose mother should behave or of how goslings learn. Rather, he watched over and over again to gather data as to what regular patterns seemed to be occurring until he could describe the phenomenon of imprinting.

The patterns or units of study in a naturalistic ethnographic observation may be rather large, but they are units naturally determined by the participants. So much of traditional educational research demands a count of very tiny, discrete, pre-operationalized variables. In the analysis of this particular lesson, a count of the number of times that students initiated exchanges would be nonsensical. It is not that counting is not valuable, but that the number of student initiated comments and what they meant would vary dramatically from the first listless episode to the second active episode to the third recitation punctuated by student initiated attempts at sabotage. Simply totaling the number of student initiatives per minute would destroy the coherence and meaning that they had in each context. Rather, counts should be taken internally within the three naturally occurring divisions in the lesson and then compared and interpreted.

Given what not to do, what have we learned after an initial description and interpretation of this lesson? There is much rhetoric in the research literature about practitioners learning how to structure the environment for learning, but what does this look like in the classroom? Using an ethnographic approach, and comparing the three naturally occurring episodes in this one lesson, we have learned that there are at least two different ways that a teacher and students interact to structure academic knowledge about long-ago, far-away historical events. The two different modes of knowledge construction function within two different participant structures.

In the first (and third) episodes, the instruction seems organized around "getting the right answer." Transmission of academic knowledge is based on the status inequity between the teacher and the students. The teacher and the textbook are owners of the knowledge, and the teacher's role is to ascertain through direct questions how much knowledge the students "got." The assumption that knowledge about the ways of other peoples is composed of discrete labels and facts and displayed in short answer units is informally transmitted to students. Also transmitted is the assumption that rather than being active inquirers about the world themselves, students are passive and dependent upon the word of superiors. Motivation for learning is also assumed to be extrinsic rather than intrinsic.

Student reaction to this type of knowledge making seems to vary. Some students find it satisfactory and "the way that school is supposed to be," while other students (in this case a particular set of boys) do not function well within either this status inequity or this construction of knowledge format. They are disengaged or actively resisting a direct instructional model.

In the second episode, a different type of participant structure and meaning making is evident. The teacher asks a series of "How would you feel if . . .?" and "What would happen if . . .?" questions that momentarily prompts a more equal status. The teacher and students share authority as initiators of questions and co-providers of answers. They share leadership about what type of knowledge should be acquired and how it should be sequenced. Some students showed patterns of increased enthusiasm and motivation for this type of knowledge acquisition and an increased sense of satisfaction with what they were doing.

Several things were surprising to me in this transcript. There was no overt signaling on the part of the teacher when she moved from one mode of teaching/learning to the other. It merely seemed that her initial strategy was not working and so she "messed around" in what could be called a natural experiment as she tried shaming, threatening with grades, etc., until a new pattern of interaction "took off." Also, the speed with which an entire modality could be switched on and off by both teacher and students was unexpected. My teacher training had me firmly convinced that clear, overt directions are always necessary for cuing in students to any type of transition.

I also was surprised to learn that the content in this lesson that "turned the students on" was the mention of "freedom." Although a firm believer in value clarification and citizenship education, I had assumed that this was probably a necessary but slightly distasteful aspect of socialization done by adults to children. Teaching students the proper societal values seemed somewhat akin to teaching children proper table manners. Thus, to find it the most attractive part of the lesson, to see the "worst" boys vying for a chance to discuss with great gusto what a rather abstract value means to them certainly was unexpected. Characteristically, ethnographers learn to expect the unexpected. When we begin to "see" what is happening, particularly from the perspective of others, we are frequently surprised when some of our taken-for-granted assumptions turn out not to be true within specific contexts.

The positive feelings and excitement about teaching and learning about ancient Greece that were expressed during the second episode do not seem to be transient as evidenced by latter comments. When interviewed at the end of the year about whether she liked teaching social studies or not, Ms. T. responded:

> It was O.K. in the beginning of the year when we taught Latin America and Canada but I think the kids and I both got excited when we got to ancient Greece and Rome because that was always my love when I went through college. I *loved* it. . . . And it was different for the kids and we all enjoyed it in the classroom.

> Oh the kids are amazing. Thinking through that stuff, 'cause they weren't doing that earlier. I don't know. It might have been my enthusiasm mixed in with a topic that was something different for them. They just got involved in it.
>
> The students have trouble with understanding those (ancient) times. And sometimes they don't understand what I was trying to get at. So I thought, O.K. I've got to compare this to something that they can relate to. They need an awful lot of comparison, I think, to help them relate things to their own background.

When the 6th graders were interviewed about what they had learned in social studies that year, they talked incessantly and insistently about information they had learned about ancient Greece and the Persian Wars. They showed great enjoyment in retelling as much as they could about how the ancient Greeks had lived.

This study also confirmed for me the impossibility of analytically separating the content of an idea from its emotional affect. Both Ms. T. and the 6th grade students were independently aware several weeks later that something intellectually exciting had been happening during parts of the unit on ancient Greece. Knowledge of the information was connected to their feelings about it. Whether it is called attitude, commitment or motivation, ideas do not seem to exist without some type of emotional charge or meaning. Polyani's notion of a passion for knowledge that is meaningful (1957) helps to explain Ms. T. and the 6th grade students' continuing excitement.

Somehow this motivation or commitment has to do with relevance. Although one might initially scoff at the notion that working class 6th graders would find the ancient Greeks meaningful, a close reading of the second episode shows that the students' questions and teacher's answers were interwoven with constant reference and connections to the students' own way of life. Embedded within the "story" of the ancient Greek's way of life was information that seemed pertinent or useful in making sense out of their own experiences.

Thus, during the second episode, the participants acted as if there were an intrinsic motivation for acquiring information about ancient Greece. Dorothy Lee (1976) uses the term "autonomous motivation" to describe situations such as these in which there is thrusting behavior "exuberant, unpredictable in its reach" (p. 286). She characterizes it as individuals "striving to help create a good game" (p. 289) and notes that its most significant aspect is the sense of "collaboration"—the social relationship in which participants become fellow workers and accomplices (p. 230).

In contrast, during the first and third episode both the teacher and students acted as if extrinsic motivation were required for students to acquire knowledge. For example, Ms. T. is firm—threatens, coaxes, etc., to try to get the students to work by reading and recalling information from the textbook. However, we can not assume that the differences in attitude can be explained solely by differences in the types of knowledge that are being sought. In both modes of learning, the students and teacher seemed to be going after the same type of information: molecular, discrete, already publicly known facts about ancient Greece (Berlak and Berlak 1981).

The difference may lie in the context of the participant structures. It is in the second mode as collaborators and joint owners in the construction of knowledge that the students and teacher take the public knowledge, the textbook facts about Pericles, and make them personal. The students act as if they are trying to weave together a coherent "story of history" about Pericles.

The second mode of learning is significant because connections or transformations are being made between types of knowledge that had been represented as discrete ends of a continuum. For example, the students seem to be taking molecular, discrete, already publicly known information and using it in a problematic and holistic way:

> The root idea of the holistic position is that for learning to occur the student must think, mentally act upon the material, and "make sense" of the idea by seeing it in relationship to something already known. (Berlak and Berlak 1981, p. 145)

WIDER IMPLICATIONS

What, we may ask, can be done with the analysis of this single lesson? What implications can one particular lesson have for a more general understanding of social studies teaching and learning? Through an inductive comparison of other transcripts, I found that many other social studies lessons from this 6th grade, from other 6th grades and from other intermediate grades within this school over a four-year period were made up of episodes that reflected these two different modes of teaching and learning. This specific lesson is not atypical, and, indeed, these two structures for participation and knowledge construction could be used to continue to study what is happening in social studies lessons and why it is happening within this school.

Accounts of teaching and learning that sound surprisingly similar to these two contexts for teaching/learning can be found in other quite diverse ethnographic research studies. For example Heath's (1983) research study of "Learners as Ethnographers," Edelsky, Draper and Smith's (1983) ethnographic description of "Hookin' Em In at the Start of School" in a Philadelphia inner city classroom, and Precourt's (1982) ethnohistorical analysis of an Appalachian settlement school all describe participant structures similar to the second episode in this lesson. Each of these studies tells of situations in which the social distance between teacher and student is narrowed, in which there is a structure of warm social relations between students and teacher, and in which there is intense, autonomously motivated learning by pupils.

These two modes of knowledge construction can also be found at other levels of school organization. When Popkewitz, Tabachnick and Wehlege (1982) studied how six different schools adapted to an innovative curricular reform package, they found that each school had an ongoing culture that modified the reform package. Their description of a "constructivist school" sounds very much like the shared authority, problem solving, and enthusiastic generation of knowledge that we have seen occurring in the second episode of this social studies lesson. Both the student initiated discussion about freedom and Pericles, and the meaning making described in the constructivist school, are similar in that a problem solving approach is taken for the purpose of generating integrated knowledge within a framework of social relationships that are warm and happy. However, in contrast to the brief episode in the ancient Greece lesson, the configuration or practices and beliefs observed in the constructivist school is stable, is observable schoolwide and has endured over time.

Popkewitz, Tabachnick and Wehlege (1982) also describe two other types of school cultures that they label as "technical" and "illusory." The role of the teacher in a technical school is to diagnose what facts and skills, what discrete units of knowledge, the students do not know. The teacher's task is to then present this information as remediation until the students have mastered it. Popkewitz et al. found that teachers ask questions to which they already know the answers, and there are opportunities for students to succeed by trying and working hard. Basic skills are valued as the type of knowledge that should be acquired in school. It is important to note that technical schools are characterized by "the creation of a warm supportive psychological environment that makes it pleasant for pupils to participate in the routines of school life" (1982, p. 61). The repetition, routine, and very carefully spelled out, clear procedures afford students many opportunities to obtain closure and to be successful, thus providing many students with a feeling of satisfaction and security.

Popkewitz et al. also describe a third type of culture, which they term "illusory" schooling. In these environments they found a "series of anomalies, discontinuities and contradictions" (1982, p. 121) between what was said and believed at one level but done or not done on another. Although

78

the appropriate words and overt routines of a well-controlled and productive enterprise were in evidence in the schools studied, many of the students did not "make it." Although the teachers worked diligently presenting lessons and correcting papers, at a tacit level of beliefs, they did not really expect that many of the children would succeed.

The first and third episodes in the 6th grade social studies lesson are structured by the status inequity between the teacher and students. The creation of the academic information is structured by the agenda of "getting the right answer." These episodes can be compared with Popkewitz, Tabachnick and Wehlege's (1982) descriptions of technical and illusory schooling, because they seem to reflect aspects of both types.

In the first (and third) episodes of the 6th grade lesson, it appears that Ms. T. started out to teach a model directed reading lesson, one similar in form, intent and structure to the technical schooling as described by Popkewitz, Tabachnick and Wehlege. However, upon reflection, the opening vignette could be seen as illusory in that none of the students was engaged. At certain times within the lesson, particularly at the beginning and end, there were hints, such as sighs and references to the heat and the end of the year that might indicate that Ms. T. did not really expect or particularly care at that moment whether the students "got it" or not.

Although the second episode is quite similar in form and substance to those described in constructivist accounts and the opening episode may be technical or illusory, it is surprising to realize that conditions one set of researchers describes as relatively stable cultures found in different schools are generated within one 6th grade lesson by the same teacher and students within a matter of moments. For example, the emotional pitch of the lesson went from intense excitement to bored disengagement rather quickly. Perhaps these cultures, configurations or modalities of teaching and learning can be seen to occur as both very permanent and also easily changeable frameworks for communication. Perhaps opportunities for teaching and learning are very complex structures, complete with characteristic power and social relationships, forms of participation, and forms of knowledge that can be generated. However, they are bounded structures that can be changed at a moment's notice, just as code switching can occur between two bilingual speakers. If this is the case, several different types of questions can be put to the research literature and also to real life in the classroom.

One set of questions describes what types of teaching and learning occur (Hymes 1980); the other describes contexts or "moves" that occur that seem to trigger changes. Do several different types of contexts, with their opportunities for the construction and display of specific types of knowledge, characteristically occur within certain types of social studies lessons? What types of "moves" do teachers make that invite students to make connections between one type of knowledge and another, for example, between public and private knowledge?

Of course, these two different approaches to teaching and learning are not unknown in traditional educational research. Indeed, for the last fifteen years, millions of dollars have been allocated to describing and studying what is now called direct (Rosenshine 1979) as opposed to indirect instruction. Much money has been spent trying to demonstrate that one approach is superior to the other. Currently, the use of direct instruction is advocated if gains in students' mastery of basic skills are desired.

These studies parallel the massive studies at the end of World War II when much effort went into describing the authoritarian as opposed to the democratic style of teacher (Lewin, Lippitt and White 1939). At that time, autocratic, authoritarian social relationships based on inequality were seen as too similar to values associated with Hitler and too repressive, and so democratic teaching was judged to be superior.

However, dichotomies of direct vs. indirect instruction; authoritarian vs. democratic social relationships; or holistic vs. molecular learning (Berlak and Berlak 1981) are not organized into a format that allows teachers to learn how to use different types of teaching as needed. Also, educational research that just advocates new pedagogical techniques or new vs. old techniques is perpetuating a vicious cycle of educational faddism. For years, traditional educational research has focused on trying to find fool-proof technologies for teaching, without ever trying to understand what is happening in classrooms when and where the instructional technologies are employed.

Rather than proclaiming winners or losers or the "in" technique vs. the "out" (and cranking up each year for additional inservice), practitioners would be more readily served by educational research that describes many mutually occurring approaches. Observational, inductive research can map and describe different modes of teaching and learning; when and where they occur; who uses them; and for how long. Analyses can be made of what effects and side effects they have when they are used. The descriptions could include accounts of how specific moves trigger switches to a different instructional approach. Teachers could read ethnographic studies about different types of social studies knowledge that naturally occur within different status contexts and what they mean to the various participants who generate them.

In a review of three National Science Foundation studies on the status of the social studies, Shaver, Davis and Helburn (1979, p. 6) found that even though the professional journals may convey the impression that there has been much innovation and diversity in social studies instruction, "the textbook is the dominant tool of instruction—the basis for recitation, discussions, and for student testing." They also noted that the subject matter focus was "on topics presented in the textbook." Use of the textbook cannot be judged either good or bad when taken out of the context of specific classrooms. It can be and is being used in many different ways to accomplish many different control and academic objectives. The ethnographic approach can be relevant to teachers because it can inductively and holistically explore what is happening in different classrooms and provide interpretations of how and why this form of social studies teaching and learning is useful to so many participants.

THEORY AND PRACTICE

Very little is known about what occurs in classrooms, schools and communities. We are just beginning to naturalistically observe and describe some of the types of teaching and learning cultures in the United States. Many levels of explanation are available for what is going on inside classrooms. They range from such off-the-cuff momentary assessments by teachers as Ms. T.'s initial explanation of her floundering lesson in terms of the weather and time of year to her explanations of lessons that go well because she is enthusiastic about the knowledge and because it is "something different" for the students. Some teachers discuss the success and failure of lessons they teach in terms of I.Q., home background, or socio-economic class background of groups of children in their classrooms, variables that are unfortunately outside their locus of control. How can teachers know about teaching in ways that help them reflect on their own practice? Ethnographic researchers work to explain teaching and learning as interactive social processes within social contexts that constrain or encourage certain practices and beliefs. The explanation is not evaluative. The purpose of this chapter has not been to make a case for which approach to knowledge construction is better: getting the right answer vs. an inquiry approach. Comparison of case studies reveals that both can be generated within a warm, supportive climate and result in student learning. Both forms can also perpetuate illusory schooling.

Rather, the purpose of this chapter has been to illustrate the potential that ethnographic research has for teachers. Its worth lies in its generation of rich, contextualized descriptive narratives to which teachers may put questions. Patterns can be noted in the descriptions of specific contexts—which "moves" and intentions and events seem to occur together, how these configurations are triggered and which one would work better for what purpose teachers want to achieve. Rhetoric abounds about the need for change in teacher education and in the schools. It is a wonder to me that change agents can sustain such reformers' zeal when they do not even know what is happening on a day-to-day basis—what works and what does not and therefore what needs changing and what doesn't. Ethnographic research offers the teacher an opportunity to withhold judgment until well-informed reflection and study has been made of various learning opportunities. After structuring the problem so that it includes attention to the type of knowledge being jointly produced, to ownership, to status relationships, to emotional bonds and to values and commitment, teachers can much more knowledgeably intervene in their own classrooms to modify learning environments to suit their own and their students' ever-changing needs.

REFERENCES

Bateson, Gregory. *Steps to an Ecology of Mind.* San Francisco: Chandler, 1972.

Bellack, Arno, Ronald Hyman, Frank Smith and Herbert Kliebard. *The Language of the Classroom.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1966.

Berlak, Ann, and Harold Berlak. *Dilemmas of Schooling: Teaching and Social Change.* London: Methuen, 1981.

Edelsky, Carole, Kelley Draper and Karen Smith. "Hookin' Em In at the Start of School in a Whole Language Classroom." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 14 (Winter 1983): 257–281.

Erickson, Frederick. "Some Approaches to Inquiry in School—Community Ethnography." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 8 (Special Issue 1977): 58–69.

Erickson, Frederick, and Gerald Mohatt. "Cultural Organization of Participant Structures in Two Classrooms of Indian Students." In *Doing the Ethnography of Schooling: Educational Anthropology in Action,* edited by George Spindler. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1982.

Goody, Esther. "Toward a Theory of Questions." In *Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction,* edited by Esther Goody. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Hall, Edward. *The Silent Language.* Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, (1959) 1973.

Heath, Shirley Brice. "Ethnography in Education: Defining the Essentials." In *Ethnography and Education: Children In and Out of School,* edited by Perry Gilmore and Allan Glatthorn. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1982.

Heath, Shirley Brice. "Learners as Ethnographers." In *Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Hymes, Dell. "Educational Ethnology." *Anthropology and Education*

Quarterly. 11 (Spring, 1980): 3–8.

Keesing, Roger, and Felix Keesing. *New Perspectives in Anthropology.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1977.

Lee, Dorothy. "Autonomous Motivation." In *Schooling in the Cultural Context: Anthropological Studies of Education,* edited by Joan Roberts and Sherrie Akinsanya. New York: David McKay Co., 1976.

Lewin, Kurt, Ronald Lippit and R. T. White. "Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created 'Social Climates'." *Journal of Social Psychology.* 10 (1939): 271–299.

Lorenz, Konrad. *King Solomon's Ring.* New York: Harper and Row, 1952.

Magoon, Jon. "Constructivist Approaches in Educational Research." *Review of Educational Research.* 47 (1977): 651–693.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea.* London: Rutledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., (1922) 1966.

McDermott, Ray P. *Kids Make Sense: An Ethnographic Account of the Interactional Management of Success and Failure in One First Grade Classroom.* Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1976. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 1979.

McDermott, Ray P., and Kenneth Gospodinoff. "Social Contexts for Ethnic Borders and School Failure." In *Non-verbal Behavior: Applications and Cultural Impressions,* edited by Aaron Wolfgang. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

McNeil, Linda. "Critical Theory and Ethnography in Curriculum Analysis." Paper presented at Symposium Division G, Uses of Ethnography to Extend Theory, at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, 1984.

Mehan, Hugh. "Structuring School Structure." *Harvard Educational Review.* 48 (1978): 32–64.

Mehan, Hugh. *Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 1979.

Mehan, Hugh. "The Structure of Classroom Events and Their Consequences for Student Performance." In *Children In and Out of School: Ethnography and Education,* edited by Perry Gilmore and Allan Glatthorn. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1982.

Philips, Susan. "Participant Structures and Communicative Competence: Warm Springs Children in Community and Classroom." In *Functions of Language in the Classroom,* Vol. I, edited by Courtney Cazden, Vera Johns, and Dell Hymes. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

Popkewitz, Thomas, B. Robert Tabachnick and Gary Wehlege. *The Myth of Educational Reform.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982.

Polyani, Michael. "Passion and Controversy in Science." *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists,* 13 (1957): 114–119.

Precourt, Walter. "Ethnohistorical Analysis of an Appalachian Settlement

School." In *Doing the Ethnography of Schooling: Educational Anthropology in Action,* edited by George Spindler. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1982.

Rosenfeld, Gerry. "Shut Those Thick Lips! Can't You Behave Like A Human Being?" In *Schooling in the Cultural Context: Anthropological Studies of Education,* edited by Joan Roberts and Sherrie Akinsanya. New York: David McKay Co., 1976.

Rosenshine, Barak V. "Content, Time and Direct Instruction." In *Research on Teaching: Concepts, Findings and Implications,* edited by Penelope Peterson and Herbert Walberg. Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon Publishing Corporation, 1979.

Shaver, James, O. L. Davis and Suzanne Helburn. "An Interpretive Report on the Status of Precollege Social Studies Education Based on Three NSF Funded Studies." In *What Are the Needs of Precollege Science, Mathematics and Social Studies Education? Views from the Field.* Washington, DC: U.S. Printing Office. ED 193 051.

Waller, Willard. *The Sociology of Teaching.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1932. Reissued, Russell and Russell, 1961.

White, Jane J. "An Ethnographic Study of the Construction of Knowledge about Different Cultures in an Elementary School." Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1980.

Young, Richard, Alton Becker and Kenneth Pike. *Rhetoric: Discovery and Change.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1970.

CHAPTER 6

CRITICAL RESEARCH

William B. Stanley

Critical research is difficult to explain in any simple way. It is a theoretical research orientation, not a specific research procedure. In fact, many different research procedures can be compatible with a critical orientation. Yet critical research has implications regarding the kinds of procedures one selects and the way they are used. Perhaps the most important feature of critical research is its great explanatory potential.

On one level, terms like critical research seem so abstract as to be irrelevant to the day-to-day concerns of social studies teachers. Those of us who work in classrooms tend to be most interested in specific guidelines for instruction and classroom management. Indeed, one of the most common criticisms of social education courses is that they are too theoretical. Some of this criticism is justified to the extent that instructors have failed to make a clear connection between theory and practice. However, part of the problem also stems from a historical hostility to theory in the United States and a misunderstanding of its practical value (Hofstadter 1962). I would argue that theory is very important, because without it educators have little sense of why they do what they do. Critical research provides educators with an alternative view to help understand what they do, its effects, and how they might go about making desired changes.

This chapter examines the nature of the critical approach to research in terms of its assumptions, the questions it suggests, and the implications for conducting research. It also examines some examples of critical research to illustrate how it has been used in social education and then analyzes some of the strengths and weaknesses of a critical approach.

BACKGROUND AND BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF CRITICAL RESEARCH

As Popkewitz noted (chapter 2 of this bulletin), critical research has roots in two traditions of Western thought—the sociology of knowledge and Marxism. Although these sources of critical thought can be traced to intellectual developments in the 19th and early 20th century, most of the work by critical theorists in education has occurred during the last two decades. Until recently, critical research has had little impact on social education. However, there is some indication that this approach is gaining more attention in the field (Popkewitz, this volume; Newman 1984).

The tradition of the sociology of knowledge has been influenced by a variety of theoretical and research orientations, including symbolic interaction—interpretative and phenomenological (Sarup 1978). Examples of such research can be found in the "new sociology of education" studies that refused to take the current forms of education and knowledge for granted and questioned the view that knowledge was objective (Sarup 1978). The main point emphasized in the sociology of knowledge perspective is the social construction of knowledge (Berger and Luckman 1967; Berger and Newhouse 1977). Put another way, knowledge is made by people in interaction with each other and with their social and physical environment. These social actors are motivated by various values and interests as they act to create knowledge. What counts as knowledge in a society is based on historically shaped values. Knowledge is not neutral, given or objective. Thus, to truly understand knowledge means to understand the assumptions and values that shape its construction.

For example, the typical school tracking system that sorts students into college and noncollege categories is generally taken to be in the interests of students. However, from the critical perspective of the sociology of knowledge, by making some knowledge available to selected students but not to others, tracking may actually function to sort students to maintain current levels of social stratification. Researchers influenced by the sociology of knowledge tend to be critical of our dominant culture and social institutions. They seek to expose the social origins of our institutions and behavior and to identify and explore alternatives. They are not in direct opposition to the culture, however, and do not insist on radical social change. Instead they seek to demystify the nature of our social institutions and values. By helping teachers to understand the social origins of their beliefs and practices, they might be in a better position to make changes to help reduce some of the unequal aspects of education, such as ethnic and class bias.

A central concern of this research orientation is the "reification" of social knowledge and institutions. Reification refers to the way that certain forms of knowledge tend to become accepted as given, natural or objective. When this happens, there is no need to question such knowledge or its origins. For instance, consider the assumption that certain students (e.g., those from the lower class or various ethnic groups) do poorly in school because they come from deficient backgrounds. This view tends to be sustained, because it appears to make sense and there is evidence that such groups often lack characteristics (like middle class values) that seem to be associated with school success. In practice, however, this kind of belief can become a self-fulfillng prophecy. In other words, we tend to blame those who fail for their lack of success and refuse to consider the structure and practices of schooling that might contribute to student failure. It is in the interest of dominant groups to try to reify knowledge to gain the compliance of those with less power.

One can easily imagine why school people would want to reify certain knowledge (e.g., the legitimacy of authority, behavioral values, student inferiority). The sociology of knowledge attempts to help us understand how knowledge has come to be seen as natural and what purposes such knowledge serves. This is very important for one trying to effect social change in or through schools.

Marxism provides a second source of influence for critical research. Most of this influence is derived from the recent work of neo-Marxists who have revised and reinterpreted orthodox Marxism to analyze education. One example of such neo-Marxist influence is seen in the work of reproduction or correspondence theorists like Bowles and Gintis (1976). They argue that we cannot understand the schools without studying them in their historical context and as they relate to the wider society. For Bowles and Gintis, the dominant culture is imposed and reproduced in our schools. The schools are organized and managed to correspond to the dominant culture and thereby make it appear natural to students. This includes the transmission of content that describes our social, political and economic systems as the best possible and capable of resolving our major social problems. Schools also, in this neo-Marxist view, sort students in ways that perpetuate social stratification.

Thus schools are perceived to function to reproduce the general social and economic structure with all its inequality, exploitation and injustice. These neo-Marxists tend to view the sociology of knowledge position as valuable but incomplete. They are in direct opposition to the dominant culture and institutions, which they see as responsible for social injustice. While both orientations seek to use research to improve society by developing alternative ways of doing things, the neo-Marxists are committed to more radical change.

Another strand of neo-Marxist influence on critical research is critical theory, which is derived from the work of the "Frankfurt School," especially Adorno, Horkheimer, Marcuse and Habermas (Giroux 1981, 1983(b); Cherryholmes 1980, 1982). Like the reproduction/correspondence theorists, critical theorists are directly opposed to the dominant culture and its institutions.

But they also reject the simplistic determinism of those orthodox Marxists who assume it possible to determine correct and incorrect political behavior in terms of how it relates to who controls the means of production. Given this analysis, schools are dismissed as agencies of the capitalist state that merely function to reify the status quo. This unfortunate development in Marxist thought not only condoned the formation of authoritarian governments, but also stripped Marxism of much of its analytic power by all but removing the role of human agency (action) from the process of social change. Put another way, if the future is predetermined via an inevitable class conflict, which will result in a classless Marxist state, individuals can do little except try to slow or speed the process.

The critical theorists of the Frankfurt School challenged this view and provided a theoretical base for expanding the role of reflective decision making beyond the elites in society. They saw Marxism as essentially revolutionary, emancipatory, and democratic. Thus, critical theory rejects all forms of rationality that would subordinate human consciousness and activity to universal laws. In other words, the critical theorists emphasize the role people play in the construction of history and reality, i.e., their lives are not simply determined bv social and economic structures and forces.

Human beings help create history, but they do so in an environment that is not of their own making or choosing. If we can learn how such conditions come to be and how our society operates, we will have greater potential to transform it. Our consciousness must come to understand reality, but reality must also be changed so it will cease to distort our consciousness. Thus the critical theorists have sought to modify those neo-Marxist positions that do not give sufficient attention to the incomplete and contradictory nature of attempts to reproduce the dominant culture or to the opportunities that exist to resist domination and create alternatives.

By combining various elements of neo-Marxism with the sociology of knowledge, a critical approach to research has emerged that suggests different questions and provides a significantly different perspective than conventional educational research. As noted earlier, the critical approach does not follow any predetermined procedures, and various ones (e.g., historical, case study, ethnographic) might be employed to address questions from a critical perspective. The important point is that procedures and orientation cannot be separated in practice. All approaches to research are based on a value system or ideology. In addition, theory building is related to normative questions regarding what sort of society we desire and how people ought to act. Therefore, even the most rigorous application of procedures or technique cannot resolve the value issue at the root of research questions. Various research procedures might illuminate or distort but they cannot resolve normative issues.

The core assumptions that underlie a critical research orientation can be summarized as follows:

First, social knowledge is not given or neutral, i.e., something to be discovered and described. Knowledge is socially constructed; institutions and social behavior have been created for particular purposes and represent particular interests. This contrasts sharply with positivist views that assume knowledge as objective and universal.

Second, given the socially constructed view of knowledge, research is a normative activity that is directly related to cultural values. Every research effort represents some value position and serves the interests of some group or groups. Consequently, the knowledge generated by research tends to shape our society and culture in conformity with certain values and in opposition to others.

Third, because knowledge is typically seen as given and objective, it is very difficult to assess the origins and process of its social construction. A critical approach to research seeks to penetrate the apparent nature of knowledge and to demystify the underlying forces that produce it. The aim is to place knowledge in its social, economic, political and historical context.

Fourth, the critical approach assumes that there is a dominant culture in our society, and that this culture has the strongest impact on the construction and maintenance of our social institutions and the knowledge that legitimizes them. Critical research is an attempt to understand how the dominant culture is maintained and reproduced.

Fifth, unlike other research paradigms, critical research does not merely seek to describe and explain the world but to change it. Society is perceived as highly complex, contradictory and in flux. Human action can make a major contribution to social change. Dominant groups tend to serve their interests by subordinating the interests of others. This is accomplished, in part, by ideological rationalizations of the status quo that make such conditions seem normal, natural and even desirable. The schools are seen as playing an important role in this process. Critical research is used to penetrate and unmask these distorted forms of knowledge. The ultimate goal of critical research is emancipation from all forms of domination and exploitation and creation of alternative practices that promise to increase social justice.

As one can see, a critical orientation recognizes the political nature of both research and schooling. It is not a question of whether or not to have value-oriented research, but which values should orient our research. Thus the researcher cannot be expected to be neutral or indifferent to the questions investigated or the knowledge produced. This does not mean that critical research has no standards. Critical research is bounded by most research guidelines regarding the collection, analysis and reporting of data. While researchers are motivated by values, research procedures should be as exact as possible. Indeed, one goal of critical research is to reduce the distortion of knowledge.

Among the questions of direct relevance to critical researchers are the following:

1. What are the historical and current movements that shape the schools in general and social education in particular?
2. In what ways do our schools function to help reproduce the dominant culture?
3. How is knowledge reified by our institutions, especially schools? What takes place in the minds of individuals that inclines them to accept certain forms of knowledge as legitimate while rejecting others?
4. In what ways is the process of dominant culture socialization incomplete and contradictory?
5. What opportunities and means exist to use the schools to explore and create counter-ideologies to challenge the dominant culture?
6. Which student actions represent resistance to the dominant culture? Which are functional? How do they originate? And how might they be used to increase student emancipation?
7. What can (and should) social educators do to deal with the historical and social forces that influence and constrain social education?

EXAMPLES OF CRITICAL RESEARCH IN SOCIAL EDUCATION

Critical researchers have used a variety of approaches in their research efforts. However, some procedures seem better suited than others to exploring the issues they raise. For example, historical studies are suited to tracing the origins and development of current educational practices. Such studies might help reveal instances where dominant groups sought to influence or impose their views on the schools. Comparative studies are also useful, because they illustrate that there are alternative ways of educating and that current practice is not inevitable or necessarily best. Comparative studies can be made in a variety of ways, e.g., international, intercultural (within a nation), historical. The latter approach combines historical and comparative procedures.

Content analysis is another procedure often used by critical researchers. They examine methods texts, curricula, and other materials. Such studies can be supplemented by interviews with students, teachers and other school personnel. The researchers might look for the values that orient the content and any patterns of content that reflect the ideology of the wider society or specific groups.

Case studies are also used in critical research. These provide an in-depth examination of individuals or groups that is not possible in a conventional empirical study. Thus, one can gain detailed insights into student or teacher activity and the motivation for various school practices. These studies are a good way to explore how students are able to resist successfully the efforts of the school to impose the dominant culture. Ethnographic research procedures are frequently employed by critical researchers. They are combined with case study techniques, and the two merge when the focus of the research is a group, school or classrooms.

The following examples of critical research in social education should help illustrate some of its major aspects. Several studies by Anyon (1978, 1979, 1980) employ a critical approach in conjunction with various research procedures. In one study, Anyon (1979) used content analysis to examine 17 American history texts that were chosen because they were examples of the most popular texts produced by the major publishing companies. As such, they were a representative sample of the kinds of texts most students are asked to read in secondary American history courses.

Anyon limited her focus to an examination of economic and labor history from the Civil War to World War I. This area of study was selected because it included a great deal of "conflict of interest and a struggle for power" (Anyon 1979, p. 364).

> In reports of historical developments that involve group conflict it is possible to ascertain "whose" knowledge is provided, and to assess if that knowledge legitimates the prerogatives of any group at the expense of any other. (p. 364)

Anyon concluded that the content of the textbooks reflected an ideology that served the interests of certain groups and excluded the interests of others. In particular, the study revealed that "the priorities of certain groups now powerful in the United States industrial hierarchy" are well represented "by a hidden structure of interests in the social studies" (Anyon 1979, p. 382).

In the texts, the poor are portrayed as mainly responsible for their condition. This ideological view encourages us to try to change individuals and not the social or economic structure. Alternative views regarding worker resistance are generally suppressed in the textbooks. Anyon (1979) suggests that we try to revise such practices and use the schools to help promote a more equitable social structure.

In a similar study, Anyon (1978) employed survey methodology to determine which elementary social studies textbook series were most frequently used by school districts in the United States. Four textbook series were selected for content analysis. Anyon focused on how each series dealt with:

> methods of political participation and dissent; methods of economic participation—ownership, consumption, work and decision-making; methods of seeking political and economic redress; comparisons of U.S. and competing economic systems; treatment of persons and groups with "radical" ideas. (p. 46)

Anyon (1978) found that if one examines social education in the context of socialization and legitimation, the knowledge that "counts" in elementary social studies textbooks tends to be that "which sanctions and justifies prevailing institutional arrangements" (p. 50). For Anyon, this kind of analysis helps "illuminate a pervasive but not immediately apparent reality of schooling . . . that school . . . operates within a set of social forces and economic interests" (p. 51).

In another example of content analysis, Stanley (1981) used the perspective of social reconstructionism to analyze the recent literature of social education. The views of the reconstructionists were used because they amounted to a radical critique of our dominant culture and institutions. The reconstructionists had also suggested specific changes in social education to help ameliorate unjust and unequal social conditions. The purpose of the study was to examine the extent to which such ideas were reflected or considered by today's social educators. An extensive examination of the literature revealed that little or no attention was given to the reconstructionist views. In the main, the rationales and content prescribed by contemporary social educators reflect, and thus help reify, our dominant culture and institutional arrangements. For example, there is no serious critique of our economic system. It is either implicitly or explicitly endorsed, and the prevailing assumption seems to be that social inequality can be eradicated within the present system. Radical alternatives or ideas are almost never discussed, and when they are it is usually in a negative way. Thus, the possibility that current institutional structures and arrangements might be a cause of inequality is not considered as a plausible hypothesis.

Anyon (1980) has also conducted an ethnographic study from a critical vantage point. Her purpose was to investigate the kinds of knowledge provided to students from different social class backgrounds. She examined curriculum materials and observed teaching and pupil evaluation practices in five elementary schools. Her procedures included content analysis, classroom observation, and interviews with students, teachers, principals and district administrators. She observed the 5th grade classes in each of the elementary schools. Each 5th grade was observed ten times (three hours per observation) between September and June.

In addition, Anyon sought to make a theoretical contribution to the definition of social class. Her definition was derived, in part, from the work of neo-Marxists and includes the kinds of knowledge groups hold as criteria for determining their social class. This definition was used to help analyze the data in the study. Of the five elementary schools studied, two were characterized as working class, one as middle class, one as affluent professional and one as executive elite.

Anyon found that the experiences provided by the schools differed qualitatively on the basis of social class. First, the schools with higher social class ranking had better facilities, better trained teachers, better student attitudes, and stricter requirements. Second, and of greater interest to Anyon, the different schools provided different kinds of knowledge to students. In essence, each social class was given knowledge suited to its status in the general society.

Another interesting finding was that in spite of a curriculum designed to maintain the working class status of students, "the children in the working class schools are not learning to be docile and obedient in the face of present or future degrading conditions or financial exploitation" (Anyon 1980, p. 92). However, these resistance behaviors were few, still incomplete and only partially liberating. Nevertheless, this finding indicates the potential of the critical research model to reveal those instances where actual or potential counter-ideological activity occurs.

Other critical research studies have examined how schools might function to help reproduce social stratification. Sharp and Green (1975) did an ethnographic analysis of an "open" infant school in an English working class neighborhood. They found that, although the classroom environment was open, free and supported by the teachers, a clearly defined system of class stratification was being created. This happened because the teachers functioned within a general school structure that made labeling and sorting appear to be a natural and effective way to deal with their "freely choosing" students. In fact, the open classroom environment presented a much broader range of student behavior to evaluate. This actually enlarged the teacher's capacity to stratify students. The effects of this process were masked by the progressive philosophy of the school which was useful for "cooling people out." Sharp and Green concluded that this amounted to a form of romantic conservativism which made "the progressive educator . . . little more than an apologist of the system" (p. 229).

In another study, Willis (1977) employed participant observation, interviews, and case studies of twelve secondary English working class students. The study covered the last two years of school and the student's first months on the job. Willis wanted to investigate the process whereby the school attempts to reproduce the social order. He found that the working class "lads" consciously resisted the formal culture of the school. Their counterculture was rooted in their families and the workplace. They rejected the middle class values promoted by the school, because they were useless on the shop floor. This finding challenges the prevailing deterministic view that the schools systematically socialize certain students into subordinate occupational roles. Unfortunately, in the final analysis, the "lads" own resistance to the middle class norms of the school led to "the future others have mapped for them" (p. 198). While resistance is possible, it can also be counterproductive. The "lads" had resisted some of the essential knowledge and skills that would have helped them gain more access to power over their lives.

These studies illustrate important aspects of critical research. In each instance the researcher was committed to an explicit value position, i.e., that schools should function to help emancipate students and increase social justice. A variety of procedures was used, including the statistical analysis of survey data to determine the frequency of textbook use. In each study, the researcher sought to clarify the social origins, purposes, and implications of the knowledge analyzed.

CONCLUSIONS

There are certain advantages to critical research. For one thing, its insistence on studying schools within their historical and social contexts has considerable potential explanatory power. Most other research models tend to "decontextualize" the study of schools. Behavior is viewed as given and classified as functional or dysfunctional. Ways are sought to maintain or increase the former and to decrease or eliminate the latter.

With critical research, one cannot assume behavior or institutions are functional merely because they exist and appear desirable to many people. One must seek to understand their origins, why they are considered functional and whose interests they serve.

For instance, tracking of classes is often supported by students, teachers and parents. Students might support tracking because they think it helps them learn at their own pace or lets them go to class with others having similar skills or interests. For many teachers, tracking would simplify the instructional process as fewer materials and activities could be employed. For some teachers the assignment to an enriched track class might be a reward for seniority or outstanding service. Finally, parents often support tracking because they believe it helps meet the special needs and skills of their children. This seems especially true of those who think their offspring are "gifted and talented."

These viewpoints might seem reasonable and rational, but are they? They imply that such a sorting process is a reflection of the natural way human abilities are distributed. With a critical research approach, one would question these assumptions by examining such practices as tracking as they relate to the wider society. The critical researcher would investigate to what extent tracking might serve to help reproduce a social class structure that functions in the interests of certain groups and not others. Should this be the case, then tracking would be neither natural nor equitably functional.

The point is that critical research has the potential to penetrate the apparent view of knowledge and reveal its actual nature, including its origins and the interests it serves. Many of the things taken for granted by most social educators, like textbooks, curriculum or instructional strategies, can often serve purposes "hidden" from the teacher and students. The critical model can help unmask this hidden curriculum in social education and better explain its purpose.

Certainly a critical approach generates and sustains the "passion" explored by Cornbleth in chapter one. Indeed, it may surpass what she envisioned. Critical research is oriented by a view of social welfare; its purpose is to promote emancipation and social justice. Unlike most other models, its values are made explicit; there is no hidden agenda. In some respects this should help us better evaluate the knowledge produced by such research.

Finally, critical research brings a neglected perspective to the attention of social educators. For various reasons, social educators (and the general academic community) have resisted using Marxist analytical and theoretical tools in research. This has robbed our research efforts of a valuable orientation, one that uses concepts and raises questions not considered in other models. As Nelson, Carlson and Linton (1972) have pointed out, we have impoverished the quality of educational practice by our tendency to emphasize mainstream ideas and exclude those seen as radical. The test of research should be its potential to explain social phenomena, not the ideological prejudices of its critics.

On the other hand, critical research is not without its problems. Even though the critical researcher tries to make values explicit, he or she might not be successful in each instance. Moreover, such research runs the risk of distorting its interpretation of data. If our explicit purpose is to find connections between the wider society and social education, we may inadvertently impose connections where they do not exist. Critical researchers must take particular care not to stereotype the research process, especially the interpretation of data. The reader should consult White's chapter in this volume for a better understanding of the possible problems created by using a priori, external criteria to study and understand a culture or subculture.

Second, the nature of critical research tends toward qualitative procedures.

These procedures, especially historical, case study and ethnographic, produce somewhat unique findings that are not clearly generalizable. As Popkewitz notes (chapter two of this volume) the universality of generalizations is an assumption of empirical/positivist research models. The critical model rejects the assumption of universal objective generalizations and emphasizes that knowledge must be interpreted within a given historical and social context. Even so, critical researchers are trying to build theory and to suggest that the results of *one* study will help us understand practice in *other* situations; that is, they seek to generalize on different grounds than conventional empirical researchers. Thus the critical approach makes a partial trade-off between more explanatory power and less generalizable findings.

Finally, there are problems with the theoretical base for a critical orientation. As noted in the early part of this chapter, there are disputes among and within the schools of thought that inform the critical approach, i.e., the sociology of knowledge, neo-Marxism, critical theory. Giroux (1983a), one of the major proponents of the critical model in social education, has called attention to the need to develop a more complete theoretical base for critical research and practice. Giroux's critics (e.g., Reitz and Martin 1984; Bowers 1982) have noted his failure to either fully develop a theoretical perspective or to provide clear guidelines for educational practice and change. These are significant problems for a research approach partly rooted in neo-Marxist theory and committed to social and educational change.

Such limitations notwithstanding, critical research still provides a useful approach for social educators. It raises questions and uses analytical tools too long ignored. As Newmann (1984) suggests, we need to find ways "to resolve legitimate concerns that mainstream educators have with the radical perspective" (p. 27). I agree, but mainstream social educators might also make an effort to be more open to alternative perspectives. Doing so should help enrich our knowledge base and the social education of our students.

REFERENCES

Anyon, Jean. "Elementary Social Studies Textbooks and Legitimating Knowledge." *Theory and Research in Social Education.* 6 (1978): 40–55.

Anyon, Jean. "Ideology and United States History Textbooks." *Harvard Educational Review.* 44 (1979): 361–386.

Anyon, Jean. "Social Class and the Hidden Curriculum of Work." *Journal of Education.* 162 (1980): 67–92.

Berger, Peter, and Thomas Luckmann. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge.* Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1967.

Berger, Peter, and Robert Neuhaus. *To Empower People: The Role of Mediating Structures in Public Policy.* Washington, DC: American Institute of Public Policy Research, 1977.

Bowers, C. A. "Review of Henry A. Giroux's *Ideology, Culture, and the Process of Schooling.*" *Educational Studies.* 13 (1982): 420–422.

Bowles, Samuel, and Herbert Gintis. *Schooling in Capitalist America.* New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Cherryholmes, Cleo H. "Social Knowledge and Citizenship Education: Two Views of Truth and Criticism." *Curriculum Inquiry.* 10 (1980): 115–141.

Cherryholmes, Cleo H. "Discourse and Criticism in the Social Studies Classroom." *Theory and Research in Social Education.* 9 (1982): 57–73.

Cornbleth, Catherine. "A Reaction to Social Education in the Classroom: The Dynamics of the Hidden Curriculum." *Theory and Research in Social Education.* 8 (1980): 57–60.

Giroux, Henry A. *Ideology, Culture and the Process of Schooling.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981.

Giroux, Henry A. "Culture and Nationality in Frankfurt School Thought: Ideological Foundations for a Theory of Social Education." *Theory and Research in Social Education.* 9 (1982): 17–55.

Giroux, Henry A. *Theory and Resistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Oppressed.* Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey, 1983a.

Giroux, Henry A. "Theories of Reproduction and Resistance in the New Sociology of Education: A Critical Analysis." *Harvard Educational Review.* 53 (1983b): 257–293.

Hofstadter, Richard. *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life.* New York: Vantage Books, 1962.

Nelson, Jack L., Kenneth Carlson and Thomas H. Linton, eds. *Radical Ideas and the Schools.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

Newmann, Fred M. "Social Studies in U.S. Schools: Mainstream Practice and Radical Potential." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Social Science Education Consortium, Insee, Federal Republic of Germany, June 1984.

Popkewitz, Thomas S. *Paradigm and Ideology in Educational Research: The Social Functions of the Intellectuals.* Philadelphia: The Falmer Press, 1984.

Reitz, Charles, and David T. Martin. "A Review of H. A. Giroux's *Theory and Resistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition.*" *Education Studies.* 15 (1984): 163–174.

Sarup, Madan. *Marxism and Education.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.

Sharp, Rachel, and Anthony Green. *Education and Social Control.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.

Stanley, William B. "Toward a Reconstruction of Social Education." *Theory and Research in Social Education.* 9 (1981): 67–89.

Willis, Paul E. *Learning to Labour.* Westmead, England: Saxon House, 1977.

CHAPTER 7

SOCIAL EDUCATION OF YOUNG CHILDREN[1]

Marianne N. Bloch

Young children's education[2] in a given society or culture usually depends on current conceptions of what they *can* learn and what they *should* learn. Educators' ideas about the possibilities (developmental capabilities), aims (important attitudes, skills or concepts), and methods of social education[3] have varied over time (Braun and Edwards 1972; Weber 1969), and continue to vary by cultural context (Robinson, Robinson, Darling and Holm 1979). Nevertheless, in most cultures and historical periods, social education for young children has been designed to fulfill needs perceived to be important both for the child and for the maintenance of the society or culture. Although rare, when social change is perceived as important, concomitant changes in social education have also been suggested (e.g., Dewey 1900 or current war and peace themes in social education).

Three primary points are presented here: first, most research and development in this area focuses on how children can be taught to fit into and adopt current social patterns in society, and this focus serves some groups better than others; second, young children's acquisition of and reaction to social attitudes, skills and values needs to be viewed as an active rather than a passive process, and children's own construction of meanings needs to be assessed; third, young children, with aid, can consider alternative perspectives, can engage in social inquiry, and should be involved in such inquiry within school programs. This chapter also describes the persistent themes and issues in the social education of young children, highlights current research approaches in the field, and invites the reader to profit from and participate in such research.

AIMS OF SOCIAL EDUCATION FOR YOUNG CHILDREN

Social education for young children, whether part of the formal or informal curriculum of schools, has generally included training in "appropriate" or "positive" social interaction with peers and adults, including learning what is appropriate social behavior in school. According to Price (1982), current social studies education for young children can be characterized as having two principal aims: training for "desirable social behavior," and training for "reflective inquiry" (p. 276). Other, and somewhat less general, aims seem to include moral development (Nucci 1982), development of positive self-concept (e.g., Samuels 1978), development of helping or prosocial behavior (e.g., Mussen and Eisenberg-Berg 1977), development of concepts related to the social sciences (e.g., Robinson and Spodek 1965; Seefeldt 1984), and development of social cognitive concepts and problem-solving strategies (e.g., Shantz 1975; Spivack and Shure 1974). Children's behavior and attitudes towards individuals and groups from different class, race, gender, age and capability backgrounds have also been recent concerns in the social education of young children.

In various periods of history, these aims have been expressed or perceived differently; at certain times, other aims seemed to be more important than those that receive attention today. A glance at three of the persistent aims in social education for the young shows the continuities in U.S. educators' ideas about what children *can* and *should* learn, within the school setting, about social life within and across societies. These aims—appropriate social behavior, moral behavior and reasoning, and development of concepts about society and the world—are examined below.

Social Behavior

Appropriate or desirable social behavior has been a persistent aim, although the particular definition of what is considered appropriate or amenable to "education" has changed over the years. It has been described in various ways during different periods of U.S. education as: training for "social harmony" by Montessori programs and late 19th and early 20th century Froebelian kindergartens; appropriate "social conduct or habits" in the period 1910–1930; "impulse control" in neo-Freudian philosophy programs of the 1930s and beyond; or socially adjusted behavior and traits in the 1930s to 1950s (Weber 1969). Regardless of terminology, desirable behavior has frequently included training for harmonious and nonaggressive peer relationships; for the ability to use verbal problem solving in conflict situations; for emotional independence from adults; for successful "school" social behavior, such as the ability to work alone at times, to compete for rewards, and to obey, respect and cooperate with authority; and for the ability to be attentive, patient and punctual. In the past as well as the present, educators believed that early education could affect these types of children's behavior with peers and adults, and that an important function of programs for young children should be supervision and training in these types of social behavior.

The view of what is appropriate or desirable social behavior with others within school settings has generally reflected norms, values and patterns of social interaction and conduct of dominant cultural groups in our society. Only recently has there been an appreciation of differences in cultural definitions in values and normative behavior (see Heath 1983; Tharp and Gallimore 1975). Moreover, only recently has it been recognized that school rules for desirable social behavior may be quite different from desirable social behavior in general (Blumenfeld, Hamilton, Wessels and Falkner 1979; Gracey 1975; King 1979). Examples of trends in current research in this area exemplify the range of questions currently being addressed and the ways in which different research paradigms ask and answer such questions.

For a variety of historical reasons (see Takenishi 1981), the majority of research in early childhood education has used what Popkewitz (this volume) calls the empirical-analytic research paradigm. Such studies have, in general, relied on a variety of psychological and sociological theories to investigate relationships between specific classroom variables and children's social behavior. Classroom variables have been defined at several different levels (see Gump 1975). For instance, they have included investigations of the effect of *macroclassroom environments*, such as head start/no head start, or daycare/home care (see, for example, Gump 1975; Miller, 1975; Rubenstein and Howes 1979) on certain types of social behavior like aggression, independence and compliance to authority. The most recent of such studies examine differences in numerous types of classroom interaction patterns in an effort to determine which specific behavioral processes relate to changes in children's behavior (often termed process-product research).

The macroenvironment studies have generally found that exposure to group settings and procedures in early childhood affects children's ability to succeed in school (e.g., keeping at grade level, staying in regular rather than special education classes). The studies of school processes that have tried to find out why these effects occur show that different curricular approaches have different short-term effects on children's social, attitudinal and academic behavior (e.g., Miller 1975). However, many early educational school processes that seem very different (e.g., having significantly more emphasis on academic rather than social processes) relate to remarkably similar outcomes for children in the long run. The interpretations of these findings suggest the most important process involved in preprimary schooling may be "simply" early exposure to group settings and socialization for successful school social behavior (e.g., Schweinhart and Weikart 1984). Ethnographic studies that have studied this process more closely will be considered after additional examination of behavioral research on social behavior.

Microenvironments and group structuring in early childhood classrooms have also been investigated. For example, recent work has examined the effect of cooperative vs. competitive grouping (Slavin 1980), tracking (Persell 1977), the presence or absence of adults (Huston and Carpenter in press), and the effect of differences in materials and physical setting on social behavior (Huston and Carpenter in press; Phyfe-Perkins 1980). *Classes of behavior,* such as reinforcement or modeling (e.g., Furman and Masters 1980), and their effect on children's social behavior have also been examined; following this line of research, social skills interventions have been developed that focus on increasing children's ability to use positive reinforcing behavior (e.g., Cartledge and Milburn 1978).

Psychological and educational research has also highlighted children's thought processes and particular reasoning in response to problems that occur in the classroom. Specially developed *curriculum interventions* for social skills have been designed, for instance, to enhance children's ability to engage in interpersonal problem solving (e.g., Spivack and Shure 1978; Urbain and Kendall 1980). Some interventions have helped train young children to generate alternative solutions when interpersonal problems occur and to evaluate prospective consequences of alternative actions (Urbain and Kendall 1980). Other interventions have been developed to help children use verbal strategies to gain better self-control when faced with the need to change motoric behavior, resist temptation, or delay gratification (reviewed in Pressley 1979).

Finally, research has focused on children's ability to understand or take another's role, a concept expressed in Piaget's distinction between egocentric and nonegocentric thought (Piaget 1926), or role-taking abilities (Enright and Lapsley 1980, p. 649). These studies have examined the developmental limits of children's role-taking abilities. In general, they suggest that young children have limited ability to take the viewpoints of others or to understand the behavior or feelings of others, and that role-taking activities within the classroom can increase children's positive social behavior, prosocial behavior, and ability to perceive feelings of others (Elardo and Cooper 1977; Shure 1980).

A variety of studies, frequently termed *ethnographic* or *sociolinguistic* studies of classrooms, have used other methodologies to investigate the processes by which social behavior is learned in the school setting. Investigators using ethnographic or sociolinguistic methods have focused on the social and cultural context of schools and classrooms, on rich descriptions of patterns of interaction, and on the communication of expectations about appropriate behavior in the classroom. Common anthropological techniques, such as participant observation or combinations of anecdotal observations, classroom records, and open-ended interviews with teachers and children, provide the data. Many researchers spend extensive periods of time "in the field"—in the classrooms or schools that are the focus of study.

These studies of early childhood and early elementary settings have refocused the concern with how children learn appropriate behavior to a broader concern with cultural values within the classroom, the classroom communication system, and student roles and rules. While examples of research concerning student roles and rules will be described in the next section of this chapter, a number of studies that examine how children learn to interact and communicate in schools will be described below (for a more comprehensive review of these studies, see Minuchin and Shapiro 1982, p. 223–226).

One study by Heath (1983) analyzed the language development and communication patterns of young children in both home and school settings. The children in her study came from two different communities, one working class white and one working class black, and went to different schools. Heath spent over a decade, off and on, within the two communities gathering her data from interviews with children, parents and teachers, as well as from participant observations of children with family members in homes and of children as they began their school experience. She found that the structure of family life in the two communities was different, and that norms of communication and language use differed as a function of family structure and the purposes of communication. Although language development differed, children's language competence was equivalent within both home and school settings. As Heath followed children into school settings, however, she found that the norms of communication by teachers differed from those used by many of the children. Through careful analysis of these differences, she illuminated some of the rules of language use children needed to learn for success in school, and identified ways in which teachers could modify their own communication to better match the rules for language use children brought with them from their own home or cultural environment.

One study by Tharp and Gallimore (1975), part of an extensive research project conducted in Hawaii, examined differences in the social interaction patterns of children from Polynesian and Caucasian cultural backgrounds in early childhood programs. Narrative written observations of the ways in which teachers greeted children and their parents, and the ways in which children were incorporated into social settings within the classroom were made. Caucasian teachers greeted parents openly, and attempted to encourage a mixture of children's independence and social interaction. Polynesian children clung to parents initially and preferred social to independent activities, while Caucasian children left parents more freely and adapted quickly to the mix of independent and social activities available to children. The authors suggest that the children from Polynesian families were used to socializing with others in their home settings ("an inclusive style"), and had more difficulty than Caucasian children in adjusting to the classroom norm of interspersed independent and social activities. The result, according to Tharp and Gallimore, was that, in addition to regular classroom lessons, the Polynesian children also had to learn to adjust to the social patterns or norms of the classroom in order to succeed.

Rist's (1970) ethnographic study included observations of low income black kindergarten children from their first day in school through the first half of 2nd grade. The author describes the teacher's process of sorting children into three "ability" groups on the eighth day of kindergarten, and the way in which "fast learners" learned to belittle "slow learners" while slow learners withdrew within their own group. Rist's study suggests that teachers' expectations are formed on the basis of white middle-class standards of social behavior rather than on the recognition of any absolute or universal social or cognitive competencies of the children. His study also highlights the way in which informal aspects of the social lessons of the classroom affect children's future social and academic behavior.

Finally, Grant's study (1984) of six desegregrated mid-western urban classrooms identifies some of the informal mechanisms by which teacher-child and peer social interaction differ according to children's sex, race and class status. Grant suggests that status- (race, class, gender) related differences in social behavior that children bring to classrooms are augmented by a complex system including teacher expectations, classroom organization patterns, and interactions between teachers and children. While each of Grant's six classrooms differed to some extent, she describes differences in children's peer interactions (loyal to system, ambivalent, or disloyal to system) and interactions with the teacher (frequency, positive nature, academic vs. social conduct orientation) that influence gradual differences in children's social and academic behavior. Her study shows (1) the strength of looking at complex and interacting processes within classrooms, (2) the need to examine children's experiences in relation to peers and teachers, (3) researchers' need to stop generalizing about the effect of classroom experiences on children from different race, class and gender groups, and (4) the difficulty of generalizing across classrooms.

Both empirical-analytic and ethnographic research enable us to see different dimensions of the issue of social behavior and the cultural, linguistic and cognitive bases that affect behavior. Both research traditions have strength, and both continue to be useful for answering certain questions about schools and their impact on young children. Nevertheless, it is clear that different questions and assumptions guide the use of one or another research strategy. The empirical-analytic approach assumes that behavior and cognition can be subdivided into rigorously defined processes, skills and products, independent of the larger social or cultural context of a classroom, school or community. The ethnographic and sociolinguistic approaches rest on the assumption that there is a complex and important relationship between the social context of schools and classrooms and the processes that affect children's behavior and performance in school. While these differences are significant, again, each research approach has contributed to knowledge about schools and young children's social education. The ethnographic research highlights the relationship between school demands and culture, and the possibility that the social behavior required and rewarded in schools represents certain but not all the cultural standards for behavior. Recent behavioral research has also pointed to children's own ability to reason, to construct knowledge, to problem solve and to consider alternative actions. In the next section, historical perspectives and current research on moral education is presented that highlights some of these same issues.

Moral Reasoning, Behavior and the Rules of Right Conduct

Along with appropriate social interaction, a second persistent component of social education for young children has been early training in moral character development. The earliest U.S. kindergarten programs for young children, mid- to late-19th century Froebelian kindergartens, gave priority to this purpose and explicitly discussed the methods one could use to train "moral" future citizens. In the earliest period of these kindergartens, approximately 1850–1870, moral character training embodied spiritual training. Toward the turn of the century, however, moral behavior and character were defined by normative "American" values concerning right and wrong behavior; much attention was given to preventing vice by early education for children of immigrant and non-western European parents in order to inculcate correct moral attitudes and behavior. An editor of *Century Magazine* during this period (cited by Lazerson 1971, p. 47) highlights this purpose:

> The kindergarten was our earliest opportunity to catch the little Russian, the little Italian, the little German, Pole, Syrian, and the rest and begin to make good American citizens of them.

Social education during this period thus focused on teaching children normative social and moral behavior, attitudes and values. These were perceived to be important for individual children's success in U.S. society and for the long-term benefit of society in general. The goals and definitions of appropriate social or moral conduct and values were established by middle- or upper-class United States citizens who were largely of Western European and Caucasian backgrounds. This was an assimilationist philosophy of education characterized by the attempt to convert children who were perceived as different in social or moral conduct from the western European-derived patterns of conduct.

More recently, educators addressing this purpose of social education refer to moral conduct or traits and training in moral values and behavior (Piaget 1932; Kohlberg 1969; Nucci and Turiel 1978; Nucci 1982). Contemporary approaches have focused on the development of values, reasoning and behavior that reflect universal goods and bads, or right or wrong behavior in society; early childhood educators have not focused explicit attention on moral citizenship training as they did during the 19th and early 20th centuries. In the following paragraphs, examples of current research and theory concerning young children and the explicit and implicit moral lessons of the classroom are described.

Learning what is right and wrong is a major concern. Recent theoretical and empirical studies propose that there is universal, cross-class, cross-cultural *moral behavior and reasoning*, and that this differs from behavior, values or reasoning that simply express differences in *social conventions, beliefs or knowledge*. According to this viewpoint (e.g., Nucci 1982), social conventions or social knowledge may vary across such settings as home and school, or as a function of children's class, gender or ethnic experiences. Nucci and Turiel (1978) suggest that underlying concepts of social organization structure the development of concepts about social convention, and that young children's concepts of social convention are defined in terms of what they conceive of as uniform social behavior and assume to "exist." Nucci and Turiel's observations of preschoolers' interactions with children and adults in classrooms (1978) suggested that children learn social conventions from adults, while moral conventions appear to represent values and standards that children intrinsically understand and that are reinforced particularly in their interactions with peers. From this perspective, moral reasoning, values and behavior develop in a consistent or universal manner, regardless of children's background; they frequently reflect judgments of justice and, as Damon (1977) suggests, increased understanding of benevolence, the need for equality of treatment, and notions of reciprocity as children get older.

Some researchers question the universality of the moral values emphasized by these researchers (e.g., Gilligan 1982).[4] Others continue to question the role that schools play in teaching children moral behavior and concepts. While children may distinguish certain universal moral conventions from others that are socially derived, the norms of socially derived rules for good and bad behavior are still part of the socialization process accomplished, in part, by schools. In earlier periods, such socialization was explicitly acknowledged as a part of the school's responsibility for moral character training. Now this type of training is considered part of the informal, and sometimes hidden, curriculum. Nonetheless, a few recent studies have examined the classroom processes that result in children's acceptance of social rules as uniform and relatively indisputable givens of classroom social life.

Gracey (1975), through participant observations of children and teachers in kindergarten classrooms, suggests that the "unique job of the kindergarten in the educational division of labor seems rather to be teaching children the student role" (p. 84). He suggests that the learning of classroom routines is the main element of the student role:

> The teachers expended most of their efforts, for the first half of the year at least, in training the children to follow the routines which teachers created. The children were, in a very real sense, *drilled* in tasks and activities created by the teachers for their own purposes and beginning and ending quite arbitrarily (from the child's point of view) at the command of the teacher. One teacher remarked that she hated September, because during the first month "everything has to be done rigidly, and repeatedly, until they know exactly what they're supposed to do (during the day) and I don't have to be after them all the time." . . . by the end of the school year, the successful kindergarten teacher has a well-organized group of children. They follow classroom routines automatically, having learned all the command signals and the expected responses to them. (p. 84–85)

LeCompte (1978) investigated how children learn to work in school; her ethnographic study showed differences in children's work patterns, and the reactions of teachers and other children to norm violations. King's (1979) study describes children's growing awareness of the different concepts of work and play in kindergartens. Through interviews with children, she discovered their increasing association of teacher-structured play with "work" and that they limited their use of the term "play" to intrinsically motivated activities they themselves decided to do.

Wallat and Green's (1979) study used ethnographic techniques as well as a sociolinguistic framework to examine the meaning or function of children's and teachers' communication patterns. They focused on children's construction of meaning from teachers' communications with children. They suggest that classroom interaction and rule formation must be examined through careful analysis of what has gone on before a communication and what happens after it, as well as an analysis of classroom context. They, in addition to Gracey, King and LeCompte, describe children as active rather than passive personalities in the classroom. In some studies, children's resistance to school norms and rules is described (King 1979); in others, the active process of assigning meanings to events and communications in schools is emphasized (e.g., Wallat and Green 1979).

Social Concepts About Society

A third persistent component of young children's social education within the school setting has concerned the formal and informal concepts children have been taught about the social, economic and political norms, values and patterns in society. As the United States has changed, the notion of what young children should learn about society has also changed. For example, Cavallo (1979) suggests that during part of the 19th century children were taught that society was composed of relatively homogeneous individuals and groups coexisting in harmonious relationships; during the early 20th century, young children were taught that heterogeneous groups and individuals exist in society and that these groups, including children, must learn to coexist through reaching consensus.

Critiques exist of both the earlier "social harmony" perspective of social education and of the notion of democracy and consensus reaching. These suggest that children are also informally exposed to other concepts about social, economic and political life in school programs. The informal lessons children frequently receive concern the "naturalness" of the unequal and hierarchical social, political and economic relationships that exist among different cultural or social groups. Several critical studies (e.g., Apple 1979, 1982) suggest that children are informally taught that it is natural that some are more capable than others, that some can lead while others should follow, and that unequal social and economic outcomes and opportunities in U.S. life are inevitable and unalterable. In some instances, social studies curricula for young children reflect unquestioning acceptance of current social, economic and political relationships and patterns (e.g., Anyon 1978).

What children understand about these various concepts and *how* the concepts can best be taught are still being debated (see, for example, Elkind 1981; Spodek 1974; Egan 1982). Dewey's idea that the study of social life should start from the children's experience and be based on a "widening horizons" notion still serves as a practical foundation for young children's social education in most early childhood programs in the United States.

Activities focus on the children's concept of themselves, expanding their concepts of the family (and the particular members and characteristics of the families in their own classroom), and initial explorations of occupations and "community life." Field trips, speakers, literature and play activities are organized to enlarge concepts of family life, occupations of family members, and concepts of institutions within the community. If early childhood programs go beyond such concepts and try, for example, to focus on multicultural or international educational concepts, the methods still retain the notion of "widening horizons" beginning with children's own experiences. For example, programs either (1) identify the cultural heritage of members of the class or community with whom children have contact and explore aspects of those cultures, or (2) begin to explore a new culture through examining the home life and activities of children from the other culture. Rarely are young children formally exposed to concepts that are assumed to require thinking about times, places or conditions unfamiliar to them. For instance, historical topics, discussions of war, conflict or violence; issues concerned with the existence of or reasons for hunger, poverty, disease or discrimination have been omitted from curricula, in part because of assumptions about young children and their limited learning (for examples of alternative perspectives see Bloch 1984; Egan 1982).

One important debate that relates to whether or not these types of issues might be included in curricula for young children concerns the extent to which young children can understand and retain concepts from such experiences (for instance, see Egan 1982; Elkind 1981; Price 1982). A second debate concerns the definition of appropriate knowledge for children, given the wide range of beliefs, attitudes and values surrounding such topics in the United States. While there is a great need for more systematic work in this area, some examples of current work are presented below.

Piagetian research has provided much of the current available information on the logic and process of young children's thinking in areas traditionally associated with social studies. Piaget's own writings addressed young children's role-taking abilities (1926), the development of moral reasoning (1932), children's conceptions of the world (1929), causality (1930), spatial relationships (and Inhelder 1956), and time (1971). This information has been used by educators in a variety of ways: (1) to diagnose or understand the limits of children's social thought; (2) to plan appropriate activities or social education programs (see Spodek 1974); and (3) to encourage teaching and research that focuses on children's reasoning and thought. For many educators, one important result of Piagetian theory and research has been a better understanding of the process of children's thought and the limits of children's ability to understand certain concepts during early childhood.[5]

However, some research has challenged the notion that young children's logic completely limits their ability to learn new concepts.

There is evidence that preschool children can learn some social science concepts, as long as they are not asked to learn too many at once. Price (1982) concludes that children *can* comprehend new concepts that are related to earlier concepts or simple enough (or simply enough presented) that they do not exceed the children's capacity for processing the information. On the basis of this recent research, educator-researchers should be encouraged to help children learn important social concepts that have not traditionally been a formal part of the early childhood curriculum; however, such concepts must be taught to children with careful attention to their familiarity, simplicity, and sequencing.

The concepts young children currently learn about their role in society or about social, political and economic patterns in society or across societies are not clear. For instance, Piaget excepted, little additional research on young children's acquisition of concepts concerned with history, geography, economics, politics or international issues exists, and little focuses precisely on the school's role or effect in these areas. In contrast, research on the acquisition of gender and race concepts has been a major area of research in early childhood education (and education, in general) for at least 20 years, and serves as an important exception to the general conclusion that there is little work done in this area.[6] What children *can* and *should* learn about society within school settings has never been decided in an explicit manner within educational circles, or within society in general. In a pluralistic society, it is unlikely that complete agreement on some of these issues will ever occur. Nonetheless, little formal debate or research has been done, particularly at the early childhood level, to clarify appropriate questions to ask, to illustrate the issues involved, or to suggest well-reasoned and informed alternatives and strategies for schools or teachers to consider. Although this is an extremely complicated area (see arguments by Apple 1978 and 1979, for example), further attempts to clarify the concepts children learn in school are critically important for informed discussion concerning what children can and should learn.

IMPLICATIONS

This review of some of the persistent themes and issues in social education for young children, within school settings, suggests several points that might be considered in future planning and research in the area.

First, over the history of early childhood education, educators have assumed a responsibility for helping children learn "appropriate and desirable" social behavior with peers, teachers and other adults. While there probably is a need for such a focus during the early childhood years, the definition of appropriate and desirable behavior or conduct used in early childhood programs has not always reflected universal or multicultural definitions of what young children need to learn. Rather, curricula have reflected the behavior and conduct that teachers and administrators felt was easiest to work with in school settings (quiet, relatively passive and obedient to school rules and roles) and what was "appropriate" according to the dominant cultural definition of how children of different gender, class and racial backgrounds needed to act to be successful in society.

Moral character training has been another persistent theme in early education. While many of the same biases have characterized this emphasis in programs for young children historically, current research focuses on the separation of moral reasoning and behavior from reasoning and behavior related to changing and culturally determined social conventions. The review suggests caution in the definition of what is "universal" moral reasoning and behavior, and emphasizes continued attempts to separate universally desired social and moral reasoning and behavior from that believed to be important and necessary by some, but not all, groups in society.

Finally, the review suggests that young children should take an active part in the construction of concepts about social rules and roles within the classroom context, as well as about political, economic and social aspects of society. The formal methods used to teach such concepts reflect the notion that young children's abilities to form concepts are limited, and should be related to their life within home, family and community settings. However, the research reviewed suggests that children can be taught more than they have traditionally been taught and that, indeed, they do learn a great deal about a variety of social concepts through informal classroom processes. The current work also suggests young children can learn to identify alternatives, think about the consequences of their own and other people's actions, and might be helped to question social issues, concepts and values.

For the majority of the 20th century, early childhood educators have conducted research on young children's social behavior. Despite this history of research, in-depth analyses and debates concerning the social skills, concepts and values that are taught or should be taught have rarely taken place. One purpose of this chapter has been to highlight questions we might pose for further research and to show that these research questions are intricately related to social and cultural issues, not separate from them. A second purpose was to illustrate the usefulness of different research strategies for achieving various ends. The most important purpose was to stimulate consideration and study of the issues and questions raised.

NOTES

[1] This paper was made possible, in part, by a grant from the Spencer Foundation to the School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and stems from the research supported by this grant on the aims and effects of early education in historical perspective. I would like to thank Michael Apple, Catherine Cornbleth, Daniel Pekarsky, Thomas Popkewitz and Gary Price for their comments and suggestions concerning the ideas expressed in this paper.

[2] The majority of the references to young children, as used in this paper, concern children three to seven years old. Early childhood education, as used here, most commonly concerns preschool through 2nd grade.

[3] Social education is used to refer to the education of attitudes, concepts and behavior related to social and societal norms, attitudes and behavior. As used here, social education is a broad term that encompasses both "social studies education" and "socialization."

[4] Both Piaget's and Kohlberg's work have been found constrained and limited by their attention to young males and misinterpretation of female intellectual and moral response patterns. The fact that gender issues affect all manner of intellectual inquiries necessitates their incorporation into any conversation or discussion. See Ellen Messer-Davidow, "Knowers, Knowing: Knowledge: Feminist Theory in Education." *Journal of Thought* 20(Fall 1985); Carol Gilligan, "Do Social Sciences Have an Adequate Theory of Moral Development?" Also Michelle Z. Rosaldo, "Moral/Analytic Dilemmas Posed by the Intersection of Feminism and Social Science," both from Norma Haan, Robert N. Bellah, Paul Rabinow, and William M. Sullivan, eds., *Social Science as Moral Inquiries*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.

[5] A good description by Piaget of his method of interviewing children (the *Methode Clinique*) and the advantages and difficulties of this technique are presented in Piaget (1929, 1-33). This method, I believe, should be used to a greater extent by educator-researchers to increase our understanding of children's social reasoning and concepts.

[6] Although some of the research and issues on acquisition of gender, class and racial concepts and attitudes is described, a comprehensive review of research on the school's role in the acquisition of such concepts is beyond the scope of this paper. Excellent resources in this area are Minuchin and Shapiro (1983), Huston (1983), Spender (1982), and Walker and Barton (1983).

REFERENCES

Anyon, Jean. "Elementary Social Studies Textbooks and Legitimating Knowledge." *Theory and Research in Social Education* 6(September 1978): 40–55.

Apple, Michael. *Education and Power*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.

Apple, Michael. *Ideology and Curriculum*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.

Bloch, Marianne N. "Young Children's Experience with War: Reality or Fantasy." Unpublished manuscript.

Blumenfeld, Phyllis C., V. L. Hamilton, K. Wessels and D. Falkner. "Teaching Responsibility to First Graders." *Theory into Practice* 18(1979): 174–180.

Braun, Samuel, and Esther Edwards. *History and Theory of Early Childhood Education.* Worthington, OH: C. A. Jones Publishing Co., 1972.

Cartledge, Carol, and J. F. Milburn. "The Case for Teaching Social Skills in the Classroom: A Review." *Review of Educational Research* 48(1978): 133–156.

Cavallo, Dom. "The Politics of Latency: Kindergarten Pedagogy, 1860–1930." In *Regulated Children/Liberated Children,* edited by Barbara Finkelstein. New York: Psychohistory Press, 1979.

Damon, William. *The Social World of the Child.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Dewey, John. *School and Society.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1900.

Egan, Kiergan. "Teaching History to Young Children." *Social Education* (March 1982): 439–441.

Elardo, Philip T., and M. Cooper. *Project AWARE: A Handbook for Teachers.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1977.

Elkind, David. "Child Development and the Social Science Curriculum of the Elementary School." *Social Education* (October 1981): 435–440.

Enright, Robert, and Daniel Lapsley. "Social Role-taking: A Review of the Constructs, Measures, and Measurement Properties." *Review of Educational Research,* 50 (Winter 1980): 647–674.

Furman, Wendall, and John C. Masters. "Affective Consequences of Social Reinforcement, Punishment, and Neutral Behavior." *Developmental Psychology* 16(1980): 100–104.

Gilligan, Carol. *In a Different Voice.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Gracey, Harry. "Learning the Student Role: Kindergarten as Academic Bootcamp." In *Sociology of Education: A Sourcebook,* edited by H. R. Stub. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1975.

Grant, Linda. "Black Females' 'Place' in Desegregated Classrooms." In *Sociology of Education,* 1984.

Grant, Linda. "Gender Roles and Statuses in School Children's Peer Interactions." *Western Sociological Review,* 1984.

Gump, Paul. Ecological Psychology and Children." *Review of Child Development Research,* edited by E. Mavis Hetherington. vol. 5. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Heath, Shirley B. *Ways with Words.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Huston, Aletha. "Sex Typing." In *Handbook of Child Psychology,* edited by Paul J. Mussen and E. Mavis Hetherington, vol. 4, 4th ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1983.

Huston, Aletha, and Jan Carpenter. "Gender-related Differences in Social

Interaction: the Influence of Adults." In *Gender-related Differences in the Classroom,* edited by Louise Cherry Wilkinson and Cora B. Marrett. New York: Academic Press, 1985.

King, Nancy. "Play: the Kindergartner's Perspective." *The Elementary School Journal* 80(November 1979): 81–87.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. "Stage and Sequence: The Cognitive-developmental Approach to Socialization." *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research,* edited by David Goslin. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Lazerson, Marvin. *Origins of the Public Schools: Public Education in Massachusetts, 1870–1915,* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

LeCompte, Margaret D. "Learning to Work: The Hidden Curriculum of the Classroom." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 9 (1978):22–38.

Miller, Louise. "Four Preschool Programs: their Dimensions and Effects." *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development* 40(1975).

Minuchin, Patricia P., and Esther K. Shapiro. "The School as a Context for Social Development." *Handbook of Child Psychology,* edited by Paul J. Mussen and E. Mavis Hetherington. Vol. 4, 4th ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1983.

Mussen, Paul, and Nancy Eisenberg-Berg. *Roots of Caring, Sharing, and Helping: The Development of Prosocial Behavior in Children.* San Francisco: G. H. Freeman, 1977.

Nucci, Larry. "Conceptual Development in the Moral and Conventional Domains: Implications for Values Education." *Review of Educational Research* 52(1982): 93–122.

Nucci, Larry, and Elliot Turiel. "Social Interactions and the Development of Social Concepts in Preschool Children." *Child Development* 49(1978): 400–407.

Persell, C. "Tracking." In C. H. Persell, *Education and Inequality.* New York: The Free Press, 1977.

Phyfe-Perkins, Elizabeth. "Children's Behavior in Preschool Settings: A Review of Research Concerning the Influence of the Physical Environment." *Current Topics in Early Childhood Education,* Vol. 3, edited by Lillian G. Katz. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1980.

Piaget, Jean. *Judgment and Reasoning in the Child.* New York: Harcourt Brace, 1926.

Piaget, Jean. *The Child's Conception of the World.* New York: Harcourt Brace, 1929.

Piaget, Jean. *The Child's Conception of Physical Causality.* London: Kegan Paul, 1930.

Piaget, Jean. *The Moral Judgment of the Child.* London: Kegan Paul, 1932.

Piaget, Jean. *The Child's Conception of Time.* New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Piaget, Jean, and Barbel Inhelder. *The Child's Conception of Space.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1956.

Pressley, M. "Increasing Children's Self-control through Cognitive Interventions." *Review of Educational Research,* 49(1979): 319–370.

Price, Gary G. "Cognitive Learning in Early Childhood Education: Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies." In *Handbook of Research in Early Childhood Education,* edited by Bernard Spodek. New York: Free Press, 1982.

Rist, Ray. "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education." *Harvard Education Review* 40(1970): 411–451.

Robinson, Nancy M., Halbert B. Robinson, M. T. Darling and G. A. Holm. *A World of Children: Day Care and Preschool Institutions,* Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1979.

Robinson, Helen F., and Bernard Spodek. *New Directions in the Kindergarten,* New York: Teachers College Press, 1965.

Rubenstein, Judith L., and Carolee Howes. "Caregiving and Infant Behavior in Day Care and in Homes." *Developmental Psychology* 15(1979): 1–24.

Samuels, Samuel. *Enhancing Self-Concept in Early Childhood.* New York: Human Sciences Press, 1977.

Schweinhart, Lawrence, and David Weikart. *Changed Lives.* Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press, 1984.

Seefeldt, Carol. *Social Studies for the Preschool-Primary Child,* 2nd ed. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1984.

Shantz, Carolyn U. "The Development of Social Cognition." *Review of Child Development Research,* vol. 5, edited by E. Mavis Hetherington. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Shure, M. B. "Real-life Problem-solving for Parents and Children: An Approach to Social Competence." *Social Competence,* edited by D. P. Pathjen and J. P. Foreyt. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press, 1980.

Slavin, R. "Cooperative Learning." *Review of Education Research.* 50(1980): 315–342.

Spender, Dale. *Invisible Women: The Schooling Scandal.* London: Writers and Readers Press, 1982.

Spivack, G., and M. B. Shure. *Social Adjustment of Young Children: A Cognitive Approach to Solving Real-life Problems.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Spivack, G., and M. B. Shure. *A Mental Health Program for Kindergarten Children. A Training Script.* Philadelphia: Department of Mental Health Sciences, Hahnemann Community Mental Health/Mental Retardation Center, 1978.

Spodek, Bernard. "Social Studies for Young Children: Identifying Intellectual Goals." *Social Education* 36(January 1974): 40–52.

Takenishi, Ruby. "Early Childhood Education and Research: The Changing Relationship." *Theory into Practice* 20(Spring 1981): 86–92.

Tharp, Roland C., and Ronald Gallimore. The Mutual Problems of Hawaiian-American Students and the Public Schools (Tech. Rep. No. 1). Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1975.

Urbain, E. S., and P. C. Kendall. "Review of Social-Cognitive Problem-Solving Interventions with Children." *Psychological Bulletin* 88(1980): 109–143.

Walker, Steven, and Len Barton. *Gender, Class, and Education*, New York: The Falmer Press, 1983.

Wallat, Cynthia, and Judith Green. "Social Rules and Communicative Contexts in the Kindergarten." *Theory into Practice* 18(1979): 275–284.

Weber, Evelyn. *The Kindergarten*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1969.

CHAPTER 8

SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS AS RESEARCHERS

Judith Torney-Purta

"Is the grass greener or browner on the other side of the fence?"—the symbolic fence dividing those who do research about education from those in classrooms who are expected to use that research. Both groups are often criticized—those who do research for studying esoteric topics with little relationship to the day-to-day problems of teachers and those in classrooms for failing to modify their practice in line with research findings that are well documented. People on each side of the fence have had difficulty in taking the point of view of people on the other, and in analyzing what the problems and possibilities are in each setting—how brown or green the grass actually is, and how its health could be improved. This chapter can help individuals on each side form a clearer view of what those on the other side do and of the areas of common concern in which collaboration in research might be both possible and mutually profitable. Helping social studies teachers become more active in research is especially important because we need better articulation of what good social studies instruction is and because we need to document achievement in a more satisfying way than multiple choice tests of factual information.

This chapter will focus on how teachers can become more active participants in research, investigating topics of concern to them, and on how they can begin to think in a research mode about classroom issues and problems. The term "mode" is used for a reason. Many teachers have been exposed to courses in "research methods" usually with a primary focus on statistics. It is easy to understand why these teachers see research as an enterprise that demands a specialist. The term "research mode" implies approaching a problem with a particular mind-set rather than a particular set of procedures or statistics. The basis of thinking in the research mode is analysis of and reflection about the process of education. That means, among other things, attempting to identify underlying values or assumptions and viewing problems from several different points of view. An Australian and a Canadian writing about this process have used similar terminology to describe a broadened view of educational research:

> Emphasis is placed on the nature of the research act, that is, on disciplined inquiry, rather than on specialized research design and methodology; the interrelationship between teaching and research is strengthened by enabling the teacher to see his or her normal teaching activity as one that includes research activity.[1]

In summary, the research mind-set is not necessarily connected with any particular research procedure—empirical/statistical or ethnographic, for example. However, the habit of "thinking in a research mode" does not arise without conscious attempts to develop it.

To introduce the idea of teachers thinking in a research mode, four questions will be addressed. First, what is known about teachers as active participants in research that can be helpful to social studies teachers? Second, what are the basic elements of the mind-set called the research mode? Third, how might one find an appropriate question in the social studies to focus on in a research mode? Fourth, what can the individual teacher or researcher do to promote classroom research, and how can a professional organization (such as NCSS) be of help?

An ideal way to introduce the idea of thinking in a research mode would have been for a classroom teacher and an educational researcher to write this chapter collaboratively. Two examples of such writing are a book-length publication dealing with psychological research conducted collaboratively[2] and a chapter reporting the collaboration of an ethnographic observer and a teacher in a bilingual classroom.[3] I hope that in a year or so the projects described in the last section of this chapter will have reached the point where such a collaborative presentation is possible.

My own interest in collaboration goes back to the presentation I made as the recipient of the NCSS Exemplary Research Award in 1978. When I was thinking of ways to make research more influential in improving social studies practice, I concluded that establishing a network of teachers doing research in their own classrooms had great potential. I recently renewed my interest in teacher research when I was reminded in several conversations with teachers that many of them seemed bored or disgusted with research that I, by contrast, had found fascinating; when I realized that I needed more information about classroom problems from several perspectives; and when I reacted against the passive role assigned to teachers in much of the current debate about educational reform.

What is known about teachers as active participants in research that can be helpful to social studies teachers? Recent interest in classroom action research can be traced back to the work of Lawrence Stenhouse and to the humanities curriculum project in England. Stenhouse wrote:

> Each classroom is a laboratory, each teacher a member of the scientific community. . . . The outstanding characteristic of the extended professional is capacity for autonomous professional self development through systematic self study, through the study of the work of other teachers, and through the testing of ideas by classroom research procedures.[4]

This is, in Stenhouse's view, an emancipatory experience for teachers and the only way in which lasting educational reform can take place.

John Elliott's group at the Cambridge Institute of Education has expanded the Stenhouse model and has begun the Classroom Action Research Network with regular publications and membership, primarily in the UK but also in the U.S., Canada and Australia. About ten years ago, beginning with a group of 40 teachers investigating inquiry/discovery teaching, Elliott's Ford Project took an approach moving away from the then popular process-product teaching model in which the teacher and his or her behavior was seen as the cause of student learning.[5] The new approach required seeing the classroom from several points of view in order to capture the reciprocal influences teachers and students had on each other. Teachers were encouraged to participate in the collection of data about their classrooms from at least three perspectives, often called "triangulation." The three modes of data collection might include field notes kept by teachers with reflections on classroom events; classroom observations, either by other teachers or by project observers; teacher interviews, sometimes prompted by a video or audio recording of part of the observation; and student interviews or questionnaires. The development of trust, with the assurance that data would be shared only with the teacher's explicit permission, was an essential aspect of the process. Some teachers kept field notes in preference to being observed, others participated in several kinds of data collection; some took part in identifying salient patterns in their teaching and in reflective discussion of the totality of data, sometimes with the observer alone and sometimes with other teachers; some developed teams to observe each others' classes and engage in subsequent discussion. Most teachers adopted methods that provided illuminating but not overwhelming data. Over the course of the project, all teachers seemed to become more responsive to feedback from students and from other teachers.

The classroom action research method was especially well suited to helping teachers understand how they led discussions. What did they do that might constrain student expression of opinion? Did they change topics abruptly, perhaps leading students to conclude that all acceptable opinions had been expressed? Did they call for consensus prematurely or belittle some opinions as uninformed? Classroom research on discussions is, of course, particularly salient to social studies teachers.

Elliott and his co-workers see classroom action research primarily as a way to help teachers generate and examine explanations for their own teaching behavior rather than as a way to provide generalizable empirical research findings. A wide variety of publications is listed in the Classroom Action Research Network Bulletins.[6, 7] There is an anthology of case studies of classroom action research, some anecdotal and some more analytic;[8] there are step-by-step guides to planning action research;[9] there are reports on the way participation in such research helps make teachers more reflective and more critical.[10] Some individuals, such as David Hopkins, have written both practical guides to doing research in one's classroom[11] and reflective essays about the conceptualization and value of such a process in teacher emancipation.[12] One of Hopkins' conclusions provides a valuable context for this discussion of teacher research. He points to the common denominator of concern in all research, inquiry and self-monitoring for systematic, self-conscious, and rigorous reflection. He also notes the extent to which the emphasis on statistical manipulation in psychological research has conditioned and limited the way people think about research.

> Validity, reliability, and generalisability are necessary to escape the sentimental anecdote that often replaces research designs in education and gives teacher research a bad name. Teacher researchers need to establish standards and criteria applicable to their area of activity, rather than assume (and then reject) criteria designed for different procedures.[13]

Before discussing what some of those criteria might be, it is important to correct any impression that only the British, the Canadians and the Australians have been concerned with classroom research.

Some U.S. investigators at the Far West Laboratory, the University of Texas, Ohio State and the University of New Hampshire have brought together university faculty and classroom teachers for collaborative research. C. W. Day[14] from the University of Nottingham and Sharon Oja[15] from the University of New Hampshire arrived at remarkably similar conclusions about the role served by the university faculty member who collaborates with the classroom teacher. First, especially at the beginning of a project, he or she serves as a knowledge broker, filling in gaps of information, often about research procedures. Second, the university collaborator throughout the project promotes group and interpersonal processes by helping to define goals, asking clarifying questions, raising issues about the context in which the research is conducted, reflecting and acknowledging uncertainty on the part of participants, and recognizing blocks to progress. This can be an especially important role when teachers have had little experience in research planning. Third, the university collaborator serves an important function as a symbol of the importance of the research endeavor and in modeling attitudes of objectivity and problem-solving strategies; he or she provides reassurance that experimentation and reflection are valuable and that solutions can be found to perplexing problems. Finally, the university collaborator serves as a detective, helping to fit divergent pieces of information together from the perspective of an outsider. These roles may be as difficult for some educational researchers to adopt as the role of researcher is for some teachers.

A number of potential benefits to teachers arise from participation in this process. The first concerns the social and collaborative context of classroom research. Teachers often discover during their initial years of teaching that the educational problems in real classrooms are less structured than the problems encountered during their training. In particular, the context of the school in its social setting, including colleagues, administrators, and parents, adds a new dimension. Classroom research gives teachers an opportunity for collaborative discussion and reflection with colleagues about these problems, which will often lead to their playing a more active role in educational improvement efforts.

The second benefit concerns the temporal context of classroom research. A major reason for teacher frustration is that students' difficulties are often not amenable to short-term solutions of the kind suggested by some published research. Collaborative research, designed and carried out over a period of months and years, gives the teacher an opportunity to assess the practicality of innovations on a long-term basis.

A particular benefit for social studies teachers to participation in classroom collaborative research is providing students with a model of the approach of social science that they read about in textbooks. University faculty members can also benefit substantially. Field-based research exposes faculty, even those who do not regularly supervise students, to classroom realities. Experience in collaborative research efforts makes it more likely that teachers will feel comfortable seeking advice from education faculty. Finally, collaborative research allows faculty access to types of data relating to their research that may be difficult or impossible to obtain under other circumstances.

What are the basic elements of the mind-set called the research mode? Although this chapter is not intended to be a quick course in the specifics of classroom research, an important purpose is to demythologize certain aspects of research without discarding its essential features. Foster and Nixon[16] describe "disciplined inquiry" into educational matters. That phrase is an important one; it corresponds to a definition proposed in 1969 by the National Academy of Education:

> The disciplined inquiry is conducted and reported in such a way that the argument can be painstakingly examined (with) a premium on objectivity and evidential test . . . . A disciplined inquiry has an internal consistency that requires colleagues to take the findings seriously, even when they disagree with them.[17]

One can find educational research that meets the criteria of disciplined inquiry originating from a variety of sources and using a variety of means of data collection and analysis. I believe that there are three essentials of the research mode:

First, objectivity. That does not necessarily mean a quantitative approach or listing null hypotheses, but it does mean trying to identify and state assumptions and to recognize possible barriers to objectivity that exist in the situation. Objectivity does not necessarily mean the use of a standardized or multiple choice test, but it does mean that our interpretation of an observation or scoring of a open-ended response is checked out with others to avoid an interpretation that is meaningful or credible only to the individual who constructed it.

Second, attempt to communicate to colleagues the major steps in the process of designing the research and analyzing its meaning. That process helps to fulfill the objectivity criterion and makes it possible for others to replicate or extend a piece of work, or to criticize it in an appropriate fashion. This communication to colleagues is also valuable because it makes us examine our own thinking process by taking the perspective of someone else.

Third, search for alternatives. That means the triangulation discussed by Elliott—for example, three sources of data, such as giving surveys to students or scoring their open-ended responses to questions, having another teacher observe a lesson, and keeping field notes. Because it is impossible to control all the important factors in a study in a school setting, reflecting on alternative explanations for findings is also important.

These three principles arising from the research mode are more important in teacher research than strict rules about random assignment or access to large samples. Describing the characteristics of the mind-set of the research mode is a way of demythologizing research at the same time its essential features are retained.

How might one find an appropriate problem in the social studies to focus on in a research mode?

There is no single source of good research problems in the social studies (or in any field). Let us examine research on political attitudes and knowledge for some examples of different sources.

The paradigm often cited as ideal is that research questions should be designed as tests of theory. One of the early studies of political socialization, led by David Easton and Robert Hess, was tied to two different theoretical frameworks. Easton wished to test parts of his political systems theory by investigating the origins in childhood of the widespread support for the government observed among adults. Hess, on the other hand, was interested in the application of theories from developmental psychology to understand how children became related to the legal and the political system. Theory is not the only source for research questions, however.

Observers of societal trends and associated social problems often suggest research questions. College student activism in the 1960s stimulated research about the social studies curriculum these students had studied in elementary and secondary school; was it too realistic and controversial in its discussion of political issues, or not realistic enough? Concern in Great Britain about student activism and about the large number of those leaving school who had never studied practical politics led to the political literacy project's research inquiring about the average level of political sophistication among school leavers.

Research questions sometimes arise from federal or state policy. The teaching of United States history and civics is mandated in nearly all the 50 states. What kind of history should be taught? Do the findings of research in developmental psychology suggest that specific courses should be offered at certain grade levels?

Evaluation of social studies programs has become widespread. Often this evaluation takes places on a district level and cannot take account of the context of a given school where a program may have certain advantages or disadvantages. Many research problems can arise out of evaluations. In fact it is not always easy to separate evaluation from research—nor is it necessarily desirable. Further, innovations in social studies programs are often implemented without provisions being made for evaluation. Teachers who are implementing these innovations can often perform a valuable service by doing research and reflecting on these new methods in their classrooms.

Research problems sometimes arise from interest in the effect of a particular political event, like the nomination of a woman for vice-president, or a new technology, like computer simulations of political situations.

The reflections of practitioners who are coping on an everyday basis with problems in their classrooms, such as students' boredom or inability to participate in group projects, are a valid but too little used source of research questions.

The mode of research thinking can be applied to a wide range of problems in the social studies. The teacher has a unique interest in and access to many of these. Once such a mind-set becomes habitual, a rich variety of research questions will suggest themselves.

What can the individual teacher or researcher do to promote classroom research, and how can a professional organization (such as NCSS) be of help?

At the 1983 meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies Research Advisory Committee, I proposed classroom action research as one of the Committee's priorities for the year. Two members of the Committee—Mary McFarland, Social Studies Coordinator of the Parkway School System in Missouri, and K. G. Dueck, Director of Teacher Education at the University of Calgary in Alberta, Canada—both expressed interest. Two independent projects were initiated, along with plans to communicate between them.

At Parkway, an innovative social studies curriculum project with teams of elementary teachers has been under way for several years. In 1984 we evaluated this project using a variety of instruments including standardized tests (SRA), criterion-referenced multiple choice tests, ratings of tape-recorded discussions with kindergarten and 1st grade children, and scoring of essay-type questions answered by 6th graders in the fall and the spring. Some of the scoring was developed in consultation with a group of teachers, and during the 1984–85 school year teachers conducted research in their own classrooms on aspects of the program they had selected. The problems chosen for classroom research by these teachers tend to be either promising or challenging aspects of their curriculum. To give two examples: How can one help children understand the point of view of those in other countries, cultures or historical periods? Does peer editing make a difference in the content and organization of social studies essays? One group of teachers conducting a project collaboratively began to discuss among themselves why verbal statements in a group discussion often appeared not to be good indicators of how a child views a situation or whether a concept has been internalized.

Some of the teachers noted that they had become more interested in predicting how a given lesson would work and in finding alternative explanations for students' interests and behavior. Mary McFarland calls classroom action research an "intellectual stimulant" to teachers to raise questions about what goes on in their classrooms, to observe attentively, to discuss issues with colleagues, and to learn how to inquire systematically.

The teacher research project in Calgary has operated in a somewhat different way. I taught a course in the 1985 summer school on collaborative research to nine teachers and supervisors studying for M.A.'s. The syllabus included a discussion of the philosophy behind teacher research, practice in structured as well as ethnographic observational techniques, training in interviewing, and intensive work to design a piece of research, including at least three modes of data collection that could be conducted in the teachers' own settings.

The Parkway and the Calgary approaches have not been explored fully enough to call them models. It would have been much better, of course, if I as the university researcher had been able to maintain continuous involvement in the project. But in both locations, individuals on-site have given invaluable guidance to teacher participants. Carefully planning the involvement of individuals with different strengths is vital. It is also important at some point for the teachers to plunge in, preferably by actually collecting and analyzing some data.

A professional organization such as NCSS can undertake (and in some sense has already undertaken) important supportive initiatives. The Research Committee's backing is important, as is the opportunity to communicate through publications. Although teacher research is usually relatively low cost, outside funds are sometimes necessary to cover expenses and to increase motivation and recognition for participating teachers; the National Council of Teachers of English has a small grants competition for teachers who wish to do research in their own classrooms. At some time in the future, a network, perhaps coordinated through the NCSS Research Committee, would be helpful. Opportunities for presentations of teacher research at the annual meeting as well as research skills training sessions could be useful if interest becomes more widespread.

In summary, research in social studies need not be limited to a small group of university faculty. Thinking in a research mode about everyday problems is a source of individual teachers' professional growth and satisfaction along with enhanced understanding of social studies education among the wider public.

NOTES

[1] Lois Foster and Mary Nixon, "Teacher as Researcher: The Problem Reconsidered," *Canadian Journal of Education* 3 (January 1978): 79.

[2] Theresa Amabile and M. Stubbs, *Psychological Research in the Classroom* (New York: Pergamon, paperback, 1982).

[3] Susan Florio and Martha Walsh, "The Teacher as Colleague in Classroom Research," in *Culture and the Bilingual Classroom*, eds. Henry Trueba, Grace

---

Guthrie and Kathryn H. Au (Rowley, MA: Newbury House, paperback, 1981).

[4] Lawrence Stenhouse, *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development.* (London: Heinemann, 1975): 143.

[5] John Elliott, "Implications of Classroom Action Research for Professional Development," *World Yearbook of Education* (New York: Nichols, 1980): 308–324.

[6] John Elliott and Dido Whitehead, eds., *The Theory and Practice of Action Research* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge Institute of Education, 1980), CARN Network Bulletin 4, paperback.

[7] Peter Holly and Dido Whitehead, eds., *Action Research in Schools* (Cambridge: Cambridge Institute of Education, 1984), CARN Network Bulletin 6, paperback.

[8] Jon Nixon, ed., *A Teacher's Guide to Action Research* (London: Grant McIntyre, paperback, 1981).

[9] Stephen Kemmis, *The Action Research Planner* (Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press, paperback, 1982).

[10] Warren Carr and Stephen Kemmis, *Becoming Critical: Knowing Through Action Research* (Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press, paperback, 1983).

[11] David Hopkins, "Doing Research in Your Own Classroom," *Phi Delta Kappan* 64 (November 1982): 274–5.

[12] David Hopkins, "Teacher Research: Back to Basics." In Holly and Whitehead, *op. cit.*, 94–99.

[13] Hopkins, *op. cit.*, 98.

[14] C. W. Day, "External Consultancy: Supporting School-Based Curriculum Development," in Holly and Whitehead, *op. cit.*

[15] Sharon Oja, "Role Issues in Practical Collaborative Research on Change in Schools." (Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 1984.)

[16] Foster and Nixon, *op. cit.*

[17] Lee Cronbach and Patrick Suppes, *Research for Tomorrow's Schools.* (London: Macmillan, 1969), 15.

CHAPTER 9

A TEACHER'S PERSPECTIVE

Saundra J. McKee

A principal in my district recently stopped by the busy faculty room to ask his staff what periodicals they would like him to order for their use during the following year. After a few teachers suggested some computer magazines and a couple of magazines of the "how to" variety, the principal recommended a couple of educational research journals. His recommendation met with silence. After he left, one teacher broke the silence saying, "I've yet to read any research that helps me in my classroom." Several others agreed, and the conversation quickly turned to grading procedures and new school board policies.

The above scenario is probably not atypical. Teachers I have informally surveyed are at best indifferent and at worst hostile towards educational research. Most have had a few graduate courses that deal with research, but have no desire to do it or even keep up with it. Are they just unprofessional? Uncaring? I don't think so.

Like my colleagues, I have found that educational and social studies research has had limited appeal to me. I don't impatiently mark off the days till the latest copy of *Theory and Research in Social Education* reaches my mailbox. I seldom pace the floor dreaming up new research schemes. I have spent most of the last 13 years teaching social studies to junior and senior high school students. I am currently working towards a doctorate in the field of social studies education, which has probably put me in closer touch with social studies research than many of my colleagues. At this point, I welcome the opportunity to express my frustrations and jubilations about my experience with educational research in general and social studies education in particular. Since it is usually easier and more chic to be the critic, I'll first share my negative feelings and then move on to some more constructive thoughts.

1. *It's messy.* By messy I mean that both doing and using social studies

research are often confusing and untidy. Much of the research to date has been experimental. These studies are a lot like a horserace. Subject group A to treatment X. Leave group B alone. See who does better. These studies are always loaded with supposedly discrete variables and are of quite limited generalizability. For instance, a researcher may find that high ability level third graders of upper socioeconomic background living in a suburb who are taught by a thin, six-foot blonde male with a degree from a large eastern university, using a particular course of study for a ten-week period, become slightly less ethnocentric. What, if anything, does this offer a slightly chubby five-foot-tall brunette female with a degree from a midwestern teacher's college working with low ability level, rural 10th graders? Researchers seem to prefer working in elementary classrooms. Since there are, no doubt, many differences in high schools, secondary teachers also need to be cautious when generalizing research conclusions, even if the researchers are not.

Research methods always seem to be full of compromises. Researchers are forever explaining the problems they encountered in gathering and analyzing their data. A child gets sick, two teachers quit, a principal kicks out the researcher, and the whole study turns fuzzy. One is left to wonder how valid any conclusions are, even by the standards of the research itself.

Then, of course, there are the seemingly similar studies that come up with almost opposite results and conclusions. Most conclusions are rarely earth-shaking. I am still waiting for a major breakthrough. Everything is so tentative. While it is often only the studies with positive significant results that get published, the conclusions are still full of words like "maybe," "possibly," "on the other hand" and, of course, "more research is needed."

2. *It's time consuming.* There is no quick or shortcut way to meaningfully do or make use of educational research. After teaching six classes a day, monitoring homeroom, lunch duty and preparing lesson plans and, then coming home and facing those chores, you may find educational research falling somewhere between doing laundry and addressing the PTA. Just reading a study can take several hours. Researchers love to mystify us with statistics and technical jargon, so it's imperative to have a few reference books nearby. In our "quick-fix," "take a pill," "learn it on the run" society, most of us aren't motivated to spend the time.

Doing research is worse. First you should know what has been done before and consider alternative theories and paradigms. If you're lucky, someone has done a review of research on your topic; if not, you might spend weeks in the library, since teachers have no assistants to do their legwork. When it comes to methods, you can spend days trying to be objective in a very subjective area. Then of course you need to get permission to literally snoop in classrooms. No matter what you say, this makes students and teachers feel uneasy and sometimes even nauseous. Expect few to applaud your efforts, which leads to my third complaint.

3. *No respect.* At risk of sounding like a female Rodney Dangerfield, teachers get no respect. Most researchers seem to assume that something needs to be done to change the teacher. They often imply that the teacher is doing something wrong. "He's too authoritarian. . . . She's not on task. . . . He uses the text too much. . . . She asks too many low level questions." Don't expect to find praise for your teaching efforts in a journal. Today, teachers are getting blasted from all directions. Turn on the news, read the paper, talk to a student or a parent. Why should teachers seek even more abuse in the journals or from researchers who want them to participate in their studies?

4. *Few rewards.* For all the time and effort it takes, there are few incentives for classroom teachers to do or use research. At the college level, "publish or perish" is often the watchword. Professors are hired, fired and promoted largely on the basis of their research. Presenting papers at conferences is the norm. Peer approval can depend on the quantity and quality of one's research. This is not true at the elementary or secondary level. Those who do research at this level are often seeking an advanced degree and a college position. Teachers' success in the schools is more often based on test scores, student and community reactions, and maintaining an orderly classroom. Even recent merit pay proposals exclude research as a basis for reward.

Unfortunately it often seems that what arouses intellectual curiosity at the university level doesn't do the same for teachers. I dismiss the notion that classroom teachers are anti-intellectual. Their objectives are just different. For example a great deal of research has been done on the effects of teacher enthusiasm on pupil achievement (e.g., McKinney and Larkins 1982). Now, for most teachers, this is not a burning question. Ask principals if they want enthusiastic teachers. They'll no doubt say, "Yes." Ask teachers, if they should be enthusiastic in their classes. They will probably say, "Yes," too. But ask the researchers. They'll probably say, "Maybe," or "We're not sure; more work is needed." While the dimensions of the question may merit study, they bore most teachers. Too often the researchers' questions resemble an evening of Trivial Pursuit. Too often the answers to the questions are fragments or abstractions that do not relate to school realities.

So, why bother with social studies research? It's much easier to take an Andy Rooney or Erma Bombeck stance and point out the foibles of our field. It's also easy to sit in the faculty room and ignore or condemn any attempt to improve our field. But even that can get pretty boring after a while. I'd like to suggest that we turn more and more to social studies research—both as doers and users, for a few good reasons.

During the past several years I have read a lot of social studies education research. Initially, I was surprised to learn that it is a relatively young field. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, which contains much of the social studies research, has only been published since 1973. Taking the time to read some of the studies printed there or in *Social Education* or *Review of Educational Research* can be enlightening. A person who left graduate school or stopped reading journals several years ago will be surprised to find that published studies are no longer just experimental. Ethnographies, case studies, content analyses, and historical studies are gaining both visibility and acceptance.

My reasons for using and doing research in social studies education can be pretty well summed up with the term PRIDE. I use the word in two respects. First, research can heighten our sense of professionalism or pride in our work. Second, PRIDE is a mnemonic device for my list of reasons for encouraging research: *Perspective, Relief, Ideas, Defense, Evaluation.*

PERSPECTIVE

By perspective I mean that research can provide teachers with a broader view of their field and how it has evolved. While social studies teachers are usually quite knowledgeable about the history of the United States and the world, they seem to know relatively little about the history of their own discipline. Historical studies, classroom interviews, and observations can give us a pretty good picture of how social studies developed to where it is today. For instance, one can find accounts of the lives of people like Harold Rugg who helped establish the social studies. These accounts can be humanistic, entertaining and informative. Many of the elements of the "new social studies," for example, were pioneered by the controversial Rugg in the 1920s (see Nelson 1977). Studies like this suggest that despite the frills that come and go, we are still teaching about the same things in the same way it was done 60 years ago. In fact the scope and sequence most schools use dates back to 1916, when only about ten percent of the population graduated from high school. Textbooks, the dominant teaching tool in our field, have not changed much over the years either (Morrissett 1981).

Perspective also refers to the way in which research can enable teachers to "step outside their classrooms" and gain insights about how students view what goes on inside. As years go by, I find it more and more difficult to remember what it was like to be 15 and understand how my students perceive the world. Research studies can enable us to "get inside" the minds of adolescents. Interviews with students can help us understand why they have problems with our subject or why some find social studies irrelevant. We can examine what researchers have found or use their methods to better understand our own students.

In summary, research can provide the teacher with insights into the social studies' past and present that should help us understand and improve upon our subject and our teaching in the 1980s and beyond.

RELIEF

Teachers often feel frustrated and isolated in their classrooms. Despite all my high expectations and efforts, I realized long ago that a lot of students are bored with social studies. Reading research has shown me that it is not just my students. Virtually all studies of student interest report that students across the nation rank social studies low in relation to other school subjects. While the reasons for this are complex and varied, it is rather comforting to know that most social studies teachers face low student interest daily.

In addition, researchers have found that teachers and teaching may account for as little as ten percent of the variance in student learning (Gage 1978). In other words, the teacher is only one of the many "factors" that affect how much and how well Johnny and Jenny learn. The individual characteristics of teachers do not seem to have as much impact as some would have us to believe (Stephens 1967). The students of that Phi Beta Kappa down the hall with five masters degrees may do no better than our kids in the long run. Researchers are discovering that factors like the political climate and school environment are just as important. Now don't shrug and ask, "Then why should I bother?" What the teacher does for that ten percent variance is still important, and teachers do influence climate and environment. Just don't get an ulcer because half of your students do not know or could care less about the causes of World War I a month after you've taught it . . . or even that day.

Reading research studies has provided me with additional relief through a realization that I am not a failure if all my students do not register to vote. Attitudes appear to be a really shaky area. Curriculum guides, school boards and administrators like to put the burden of teaching good citizenship and positive attitudes towards different groups upon the social studies teachers. Researchers keep finding that attitude change is very difficult to accomplish. Don't become despondent if after a year of World Cultures your students exhibit much of the ethnocentrism they came in with. Attitudes are set early and are especially difficult to change once a child reaches adolescence (see Torney 1979).

Do you sometimes feel like you are teaching by "the seat of your pants or skirt"? So do most others. It appears that we all enter the classroom with a few rules and theories, but researchers have found that most of us teach the way we were taught in school, relying heavily on the text and using a method somewhere between lecture and question and answer (Wiley and Race 1977).

In many ways, what we do resembles more a folk art than a science. There is to date no one "best way" to teach. Knowing that social studies teachers across the nation face the same frustrations somehow makes it easier to stay in a demanding field and try to make it better.

IDEAS

I would like to remain a teacher for many years. If I had wanted to do the same thing over and over, year after year, I would have sought a job on an assembly line. New things are being learned all the time in education. Modifying our practice in light of new research can make our jobs more exciting and rewarding. Sometimes when hit with the "blahs," I'll leaf through a journal and find a strategy I hadn't considered. For instance a recent study in *Social Education* dealt with the effectiveness of team learning techniques with low achievers in social studies (Allen and VanSickle 1984). The researchers not only reported success with team learning techniques, but listed sources of additional information. I tried some of the same techniques with low achievers in my own classes and had similar success.

DEFENSE

Teachers are often expected to defend their programs to administrators, school boards and the community. Knowledge of the research in our field can better equip us to justify and advocate social studies education at a time when it is being crowded out with the clamor for more math, science, reading and computer courses. Suppose School District X decides to eliminate required courses in civics or government from the curriculum. Despite impassioned pleas from teachers, the courses are squeezed out. After a couple of years, a group of teachers decides to test student's knowledge of th government. The results, as expected, are below national averages. T findings are shared with the local media and parent groups. Within a short period, required courses in government reappear in the district's curriculum. The teachers in District X made research work for them.

Next, an administrator in District X directed social studies teachers to design multiple choice questions to assess whether the students were "becoming" good citizens. The administrator assured the teachers that competency testing would improve the quality of instruction and citizenship outcomes in District X. When a few of the teachers did some reading and presented the dubious results of competency testing, more teachers protested, and eventually the test making was discontinued. Once again, research to the rescue!

Knowledge of and utilization of research in our field can only add to our expertise. At times, this knowledge can be a valuable weapon when it comes to adding, maintaining or disposing of programs.

EVALUATION

Everyday my mailbox is jammed with fliers. "Try this book, this unit, this film, this activity." It is overwhelming. Each one promises to "increase student learning . . . motivate slow learners . . . inspire the masses." With my limited budget, I like to know what is most likely to work. I simply do not have the time to test and evaluate everything that comes along. Unfortunately, a lot of publishers do not test these materials either. Fortunately, many researchers no longer reside in ivory towers. Many are actually in the classrooms and are evaluating new materials and approaches and are very willing to share their findings. Textbook analyses, for example, are fascinating but rather time consuming. From researchers who do them, we can learn how textbooks can distort ideas through their handling of themes and treatment of various groups in our society. Anyon's research supports the notion that bias and subjectivity were still present in United States history texts of the 1970s. Her work also suggests that some U.S. history texts promote mobility for only a select few (Anyon 1979). We can become more intelligent consumers with minimal effort. Publishing is a big business with its major objective being profit. We owe it to our students to look beyond the shiny cover before we order.

Research may also help us in evaluating our own efforts in the classroom. Instruments developed by researchers in our field can often be adapted for use in our own classrooms and provide valuable feedback for assessing the success of our efforts. In recent years, for example, I have come to use pre- and posttests with my classes. They help me to avoid redundancy as well as indicate what changes may have taken place in my students' knowledge and attitudes over the year.

In summary, research has a lot to offer classroom teachers despite its present shortcomings. At present, there is no true research base from which we can derive all the answers or prescribe all practices. However, what exists can help us interpret our teaching experience and examine alternative methods. It can also bolster our professionalism and enhance our pride in being a teacher. In choosing a doctor, we want the ones most up to date and aware of the latest advances and research in their field. As teachers, we owe our clients, the students, as much. The fact that research findings may be complex and contradictory is no reason to abandon the search.

A few years ago a book came out called *Real Men Don't Eat Quiche.* While obviously overstated, it effectively pointed out some of our stereotypical notions about men in our society. Several spin-offs of the book followed. Perhaps we need a spin-off titled *Real Teachers Don't Need Research* that would scrutinize the myth of the all-knowing teacher who stubbornly relies only upon intuition and regards reliance on research findings as a sign of personal or professional weakness. This archetype needs to be revised, because most teachers are motivated to improve. However, most teachers have been socialized not to seek outside help. *Real* teachers acknowledge that despite great success, there is room for improvement in our schools. *Real* teachers need to be able to admit, without embarassment or criticism, that they do not have all the answers. *Real* teachers need to be supported and encouraged to participate in the purposeful, systematic search for these answers. This support and encouragement need come not from just school districts but from educational researchers, community members and political leaders. To seek new answers should never be regarded as a sign of weakness, but as a sign of growth.

REFERENCES

Allen, William H., and Ronald L. VanSickle. "Learning Teams and Low Achievers." *Social Education* 48 (January 1984): 60–64.

Gage, Nathaniel L. *The Scientific Basis of the Art of Teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1978.

McKinney, C. Warren, and A. Guy Larkins. "Effects of High, Normal and Low Enthusiasm on Secondary Social Studies Achievement." *Social Education* 46 (April 1982): 290–292.

Morrissett, Irving. "The Needs of the Future and the Constraints of the Past." In *The Social Studies*, edited by Howard D. Mehlinger and O. L. Davis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Nelson, Murray R. "The Development of the Rugg Social Studies Materials," *Theory and Research in Social Education* 5 (December 1977): 64–83.

Stephens, J. M. *The Process of Schooling: A Psychological Examination*. New York: Holt, 1967.

Torney, Judith V. "Psychological and Institutional Obstacles to the Global Perspective in Education." In *Schooling for A Global Age*, edited by James M. Becker. New York: McGraw Hill, 1979.

Wiley, Karen B., and Jeanne Race. *The Status of Pre-College Science, Mathematics and Social Science Education: 1955–75, Vol III: Social Science Education*. Boulder: Social Science Educational Consortium, 1977.

CHAPTER 10

SOCIAL STUDIES RESEARCH RECONSIDERED

Catherine Cornbleth

Our intent has been to introduce the multiple perspectives and practices of social studies research. This we have accomplished, although we certainly have not covered or uncovered the full range of possibilities. If you have followed our itinerary in reading this bulletin, you have encountered research passions, paradigms and purposes, and you have sampled different kinds of research in social studies education. You have also probably noted that individual authors and chapters reflect varying passions, paradigms and purposes. So, now what? What can we make of the ideas, illustrations and arguments presented here? Several answers to this question come to mind, and no doubt you will think of others.

One answer is that, with awareness of different kinds of research in social studies education, we are in a better position to make informed judgments about the research we read and the research we do. This awareness is much more than procedural. It also includes awareness of the underlying assumptions, the values and the purposes served by research, and of implications for using research. Each of these three aspects is explored a bit further in the section that follows, and criteria in the form of questions to put to research are offered for examining completed or planned research.

A second answer, which follows from the first, is that we can better determine what the different kinds of research might contribute to social studies education. Rather than seeing them as equally viable options from which to choose, or attempting to select the one best paradigm, it seems preferable to consider what each has to offer. This is the focus of the concluding section. Throughout these reflections on social studies research, my intent is to encourage greater scrutiny of our personal and collective notions of research and of its place and potential in social studies education.

Self-consciousness about our research is healthy, I believe, even with its accompanying discomfort, tensions and conflicts.

In talking about different kinds of research, I use the distinctions among empirical-analytic, symbolic and critical paradigms that Thomas Popkewitz introduced in chapter two of this volume. The chapters on survey and experimental research by Dennie L. Smith and Patrick Ferguson represent the empirical-analytic paradigm, while Jane J. White's chapter on ethnographic research represents the symbolic paradigm, and William B. Stanley's chapter represents the critical paradigm. The research on early childhood social education reviewed by Marianne M. Bloch reflects all three paradigms as could the teacher research advocated by Judith Torney-Purta. The teacher's perspective on social studies research shared by Saundra McKee can be seen as an empirical-analytic position modified by symbolic and critical considerations. While I use the three paradigm distinctions, I do not believe that we are limited to selecting from these three paradigms or from X number of procedures. Our options also include a modification or combination of presently available alternatives or creation of still untried possibilities.

RESEARCH ASSUMPTIONS, PURPOSES AND IMPLICATIONS FOR USE

Assumption, purpose and use are intertwined. What one assumes about the nature of the social world and of teaching and learning necessarily influences the purposes of one's research and how those research findings are used. We also make assumptions about what the purpose and use of research should be. It is as important to see the interconnections among assumption, purpose and use as it is to recognize any one by itself.

Until recently in social studies education, a particular style of research was typically taken for granted as natural, normal or correct. In part, this was because a single, empirical-analytic paradigm predominated. Just as fish are unlikely to recognize water, we often do not recognize what is an ever present and unchallenged part of our lives. In addition, adherents to an empirical-analytic paradigm tend to believe that they do not deal in normative or value-laden questions, which are seen as outside the realm of research. So, such questions were seldom raised. However, with the emergence of alternative paradigms and the formation of distinguishable research communities, assumptions and purposes as well as language, procedures, findings and uses of research are increasingly subject to question and examination, including those of empirical-analytic research.

What Is in an Assumption?

Research reflects and sustains our assumptions and visions about science, society and individuals as well as about schooling, teaching and learning, and about possibilities for change. All research thus has a normative character, reflecting selected values and interests. What is selected for study is given credence and importance compared to what is not studied. Teacher questioning behavior, for example, has received considerable attention in social studies research, but student questions and answers have received relatively little. The focus on teacher questioning carries implicit assumptions about how teaching fosters learning and what is to be learned.

By means of the language—particularly the concepts and categories—we use in our research and the descriptions and interpretations we offer, we at least implicitly indicate what is proper, good or desirable research and practice (see Gergen 1982) and how one should think about and act on matters of social studies education. In other words, the language and practice of research establishes guidelines or boundaries for thinking about and doing social studies curriculum and teaching. The concepts of performance competency and time-on-task are contemporary examples. Both emerge from an empirical-analytic paradigm where ends are usually taken as given (e.g., higher scores on standardized achievement tests) and the purpose of the research is to find the most efficient means of accomplishing them. The research itself is to be disinterested and "objective," and results are to be applied in classroom practice. But the concepts are not neutral and might well be questioned. With respect to performance competency, questions such as the following might be raised: Competence for what present or future purpose? What interests does such competence serve? What valued goals are neglected because they do not fit the performance competency mold? Similar questions might be raised about the concept of time-on-task: Time on what tasks? At what costs? Toward what ends? One might also raise questions about the circumstances that give these and other technical concepts credibility and appeal to educators and the public at large. Whether concepts are operationally defined prior to a study, as in survey and experimental research, or emerge from the study as in ethnographic research, the assumptions on which they rest ought not to remain unexamined.

Assumptions are evident, then, in what is studied and the language used as well as in the procedures employed by researchers. A hypothetical example may help to highlight some of the differences in assumptions associated with the three paradigms. Imagine a U.S. history class in which you are trying to help students learn various economic concepts (e.g., supply, demand, interdependence, capital) so that they can understand the Depression, New Deal and subsequent economic history. But, many students are having difficulty learning these concepts. What's the problem? How might it be studied? While each paradigm offers more than one response to these questions, the following are prototypical responses.

From an empirical-analytic perspective, the problem would likely be framed as a "student learning problem," and different teaching strategies would be studied to determine which is most effective in resolving the students' problem. The problem is assumed to be in the student. From a symbolic perspective, the problem would likely be framed as a problem of "understanding what is happening," and the ongoing patterns of teacher-student interaction would be studied to pinpoint communication trouble-spots. The problem is assumed to be in the patterns of classroom communication. From a critical perspective, the problem would likely be framed as a problem of "social and cultural conditions that impede student learning." Alternatively, questions might be raised about the meanings attributed to these concepts or the likely consequences of students' learning or not learning these particular concepts rather than others. However framed, the identified problem would be studied in both its immediate and broader sociocultural and historical contexts. The problem is assumed to be in the social arrangements of schooling and society.

The point here is that research is not without assumption or value. Assumptions and values should be made explicit and subjected to scrutiny. Questions for planned or completed research include: What assumptions are being made about (e.g., teaching and learning, desirable social studies education, the appropriate relationship of individuals and society, what can be changed and how)? What values (e.g., equity, justice, power, individual freedom) are furthered or impeded by these assumptions? How would the nature, outcomes and likely impact of the study be different if different assumptions were made?

What Purposes Are Served?

The purposes of a study are closely linked to the assumptions that are made about "the problem." The purpose of a study is often to assess the efficacy of one or more responses to an identified problem or to clarify the nature, context or sources of what seems to be a problem. In "Paradigm and Purpose," Thomas Popkewitz identifies and illustrates the different purposes of empirical-analytic, symbolic and critical research as follows: to further administrative efficiency by determining the effectiveness of particular behaviors, materials or organizational schemes (empirical-analytic); to understand the everyday patterns of communication and interaction that create and sustain interpretive rules and meanings (symbolic); to illustrate and critique the social and political implications of institutional arrangements, thus "demystify[ing] the patterns of knowledge and social conditions that produce domination and restrict human possibilities" (critical). For example, whereas empirical-analytic research tends to accept the predetermined or given goals of schooling and social studies education, symbolic research seeks to understand what they mean and how they are formed and communicated, while critical research raises questions about the historical and cultural sources of these goals and the interests they serve.

Additional illustrations of paradigm-related differences in purpose are found in the studies cited in previous chapters. In his presentation of experimental research, Patrick Ferguson cites a study of the effectiveness of "jigsaw" interdependent learning groups compared to "traditional" teaching. Of interest to the researchers were *effects* on students' liking for group members and school and students' self-esteem. In her presentation of ethnographic research, Jane J. White cites a study of elementary classroom interaction where the researchers were interested in *understanding* how students could fail to learn to read. And, in his presentation of critical research, William B. Stanley cites a study of secondary social studies textbook treatment of industrialization and economic institutions. Of interest to the researcher was *illustration and critique* of the extent to which, and how, textbooks further or impede particular group (e.g., labor, owners and managers) interests.

Another, hypothetical example may help to highlight differences in purposes associated with the three paradigms. Imagine that a large urban school district is interested in evaluating its 20-year-old school desegregation effort. From an empirical-analytic perspective, the evaluation might focus on the effects of integrated schools on the racial attitudes or academic achievement of black and white students. From a symbolic perspective, the evaluation might focus on patterns of classroom interaction and communication and their meanings to black and white participants. From a critical perspective, the evaluation might focus on what desegregation means in practice and how black and white students have been benefited or handicapped socially and politically as well as academically. In the first instance, the purpose is to determine particular effects, in the second it is to understand meanings, and in the third it is to illuminate the nature and context of advantage and disadvantage. Studying desegregation or other aspects of schooling is not a simple or straightforward matter.

Differences in purpose can also be seen in the paradigms' orientation to change. Although an empirical-analytic perspective may appear conservative insofar as the goals of schooling and social studies are typically accepted as given, research in this tradition is often directed toward change. Its purpose is to determine effects so that effectiveness or efficiency can be improved. The improvements that are sought, however, are usually within the system. Changes to the system of schooling itself or changes that extend beyond the schools are rarely considered. A symbolic perspective is not change oriented, although the understanding it provides may inform change efforts. A critical perspective, in contrast, is explicitly oriented to change, particularly to the social and material dynamics from which the present situation has been formed and alternative futures might be created. The changes of interest are assumed to extend beyond the school to other social institutions and relationships.

Purposes, like assumptions, are value laden. The specific purposes of a study usually reflect broader and further reaching purposes that are not often recognized or articulated. Like assumptions, they ought to be made explicit and subjected to scrutiny. Questions to be put to planned or completed research include: What seems to be the purpose of the research beyond the specific research questions or hypotheses? What values are supported or undermined as a result? Most social studies research follows from an empirical-analytic paradigm that considers effectiveness and efficiency worthy purposes. Effectiveness and efficiency of what, how or for whom are not usually considered. Greater attention to the purposes of our research and the purposes it serves might yield more research that is more compatible with the professed goals of social studies education.

Of What Use Is Research?

Assumptions and expectations about the uses of research-generated knowledge also have paradigmatic ties. The typical expectation is that research can and should be instrumentally useful, i.e., directly applicable to classroom practice. Shaver (1979) well represents the instrumental position that social studies research should indicate guidelines if not prescriptions for classroom practice.[1] Ideally, research findings and accompanying prescriptions are broadly applicable across students, subject areas and contexts. By this criterion, social studies research, like educational research in general, has not been especially useful.

In contrast to this instrumental use position, or of direct applicability to the classroom, is an interpretive use position (see Cornbleth 1982). The interpretive use position is that research-generated knowledge can and should be used by teachers, but not to prescribe classroom practice. Instead, it can and should be used to test one's beliefs (e.g., about teaching), as hypotheses to be tested in one's own practice, or as a conceptual framework for interpreting and evaluating classroom events. For example, the ethnographic study of how teachers and students constructed knowledge about different cultures cited by Jane White (White 1980) offers a conceptual framework for considering knowledge construction in one's own classroom. It also suggests hypotheses to be tested about patterns of classroom interaction and student learning. Whereas the instrumental use position relies on experts to interpret research findings and casts the teacher as passive technician, the interpretive use position encourages active, reflective and responsible teacher roles.

There are at least three problems with the instrumental criterion for the use of research-generated knowledge. One is that it misconstrues the nature of science, supposing that "it" can tell people what they should do. Practical problem solving and action can be grounded in research-generated knowledge, but do not necessarily follow from it. A second problem is that the instrumental criterion could distort research efforts toward producing findings that are more easily translatable into prescription, thus discouraging other kinds of research. Finally, the instrumental criterion devalues teacher judgment, casting the teacher as a technician or follower of presumably scientifically sanctified rules. The incompleteness and precariousness of research-generated knowledge about teaching makes this particularly troublesome. While the concept of knowledge utilization has pragmatic appeal, its instrumental version is seriously flawed (see Buchmann 1984).

The proper use of research-generated knowledge is not a question with one right answer. Some social studies research findings might best be used by researchers and teachers to create tentative guidelines for practice, while others might better be used as evidence, hypotheses or interpretive frameworks, or as the basis for critical scrutiny of classroom purposes, practices and outcomes. Different kinds of research will be more or less conducive to each of these uses. Most important is that we not limit our expectations and judgments of research to a narrow utilitarian standard. Questions for planned or completed research include: What assumptions are being made about how the results of this research are to be used? What are other possibilities? What difference does it make?

My questioning of the purpose of research as furthering effectiveness and efficiency and of the expectation that research findings be instrumentally useful is intended to stimulate self-consciousness, awareness of assumptions and alternatives, and reflection on how we read, think about, and engage in social studies research. There is continuing debate of these and other questions both within and among research communities. Standards of social inquiry are not fixed as the reconstructed logic (Kaplan 1964) of "the scientific method" presented in introductory texts might lead us to believe. Inter- and intraparadigmatic differences and conflicts are the norm rather than the exception. Furthermore, the so-called knowledge explosion and ever increasing scope and pace of change, which we are continually reminded of by social commentators, have not bypassed educational research and practice. Social studies researchers and educators also need to continually re-examine their beliefs and practices and to modify the conventional wisdom when it no longer seems wise.

RESEARCH PARADIGMS AND SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION: TOWARD CRITICAL SOCIAL INQUIRY

In my reflections on assumptions, purposes, and uses of research, I have referred to the predominance of the empirical-analytic paradigm in educational and social studies research, noted its technical character, and alluded to its limitations from symbolic and critical perspectives. Here, my intent is to develop these ideas and to explore the possibilities for social studies research that incorporates aspects of all three paradigms. It would be a kind of multiparadigm research that I call critical social inquiry. My assumptions are that no single paradigm is sufficient and that each has something to offer social studies education. I begin with a critique of the empirical-analytic paradigm, because it is the dominant one, and then suggest how its limitations could be mitigated by symbolic and critical perspectives. The focus of my critique is the technical character of empirical-analytic research.

Empirical-analytic research is technical in at least two respects. One is the emphasis placed on research procedures or technique, the assumption being that if the procedures are sound (i.e., meet currently agreed upon standards of the research community), the research findings are credible and even meritorious. While the reverse may be accurate (shoddy procedures yield shoddy results), and sound procedures are important to all research, procedural competence or even elegance is no guarantee of meaningfulness or value. The myth of methodology (Kaplan 1964), to which I referred in the introduction to this bulletin, is just that.

A second way in which empirical-analytic research is technical lies in the assumptions that are made about educational questions and problems, specifically that they are technical ones resolvable by application of the appropriate technology. The task of research is to determine the effectiveness or efficiency of alternative administrative or instructional technologies, such as Individually Guided Education, "jigsaw" interdependent learning groups or computer assisted geography instruction. That problems of student disinterest, nonlearning or disruptiveness may not be technical ones, or reducible to questions of technique, tends not to be considered. Consequently, only a limited range of questions is likely to be addressed. Potential research questions that are incompatible with technical assumptions are likely to be ignored. For example, crucial social studies curriculum questions regarding the nature of knowledge and how it should be made accessible to students, how the social organization of schooling affects attempts to educate, and how a particular selection, organization and evaluation of knowledge benefits some interests and not others (Popkewitz 1982) are unlikely to be raised.

A related technical aspect of empirical-analytic research is the expectation that its results will be instrumentally useful; the problems addressed are technical ones to which the results of procedurally precise research can be applied to obtain solutions. If problems are conceived as technical, the research emphasizes technique, and the results of research are to be applied as rules or technologies, only technical solutions are likely to be examined. Responses involving changes in social or political structures are unlikely to be considered. Research to assess the effectiveness of various remedial programs for "disadvantaged" students is one example. Another is research on the effectiveness of alternative forms of teacher education in improving teaching, which seems to assume that the conditions of teaching are either inconsequential or unalterable.

At this point, it may seem as if the research-practice relationship is a one-way street, with research influencing practice directly and indirectly. The relationship, however, is more complex as practice also seems to influence research. The conceptualization of educational problems as technical, for example, is not merely the doing of researchers. Teachers and other school personnel also tend to take a technical view of their situation and the problems it presents as do professionals in other fields in the United States today. World peace and national defense, for example, are commonly seen by government officials as technical problems of deterrence or strategic balance. Technical thought is so pervasive in the United States that it seems natural and normal. In this context, not surprisingly, researchers and educators tend to support and sustain each other's technical view of social studies education and its problems.

A research paradigm is like a window on the world. It enables us to see what is "out there." But, just as windows have frames that limit our view, so too do paradigms. Their conceptual and procedural frames limit what can be seen and how it is to be interpreted. The empirical-analytic paradigm enables us to pursue "what" questions or questions of efficiency. It does not encourage pursuit of "how" questions of explanation and understanding. Nor does it encourage questioning the language, assumptions or purposes of schooling, or exploring structural alternatives.

Clearly, the empirical-analytic paradigm is limited and limiting. It neglects significant questions and possible responses. It also tends to raise false hopes. If the problems of social studies education are technical ones, they can be solved without major difficulties. If our science and technology put astronauts on the moon, surely they can meet the challenges of social studies education. The fact that old questions remained unanswered while new ones are being raised suggests otherwise.

Before arguing that symbolic and critical perspectives could mitigate some of the limitations of the empirical-analytic paradigm, it seems prudent to reiterate what research cannot do. Research is mute about what "really" is or ought to be or what we should do in a particular situation. It can assist exploration of the likely consequences of alternative courses of action. Research can inform practice and prompt its transformation, but it cannot legitimately dictate practice. Developmental research, about children's understanding of political science concepts, for example, cannot tell us what students could or should be taught at any age.

The potential of symbolic and critical paradigms in social studies education lies in the additional perspectives they offer. Symbolic and critical paradigms extend our repertoire of research questions, procedures and results. We would frame problems differently (or frame different problems), employ different or additional procedures, and generate different kinds of responses to identified problems as illustrated earlier in the U.S. history-economics concepts and desegregation examples.

Symbolic and critical paradigms thus offer additional windows to our world. They also offer more theoretical (i.e., explanatory) potential. To provide evidence that variable A, teacher behavior, leads to variable B, high student achievement test score, more often than would be expected by chance, indicates causation but does not explain or indicate reasons why A causes B. Empirical data are not self-explanatory. Theory provides a rationale and starting point for research and a framework for interpreting its results. The generally atheoretical nature of educational research, most of which follows from the empirical-analytic paradigm, has been lamented even by empirical-analytic researchers (e.g., Borich 1979).

Critical social inquiry, informed by symbolic and critical as well as empirical-analytic perspectives, is rare in educational and social studies research. Although critical social inquiry predates behavioral, empirical-analytic science in other fields, its potential is yet untried in education, and the obstacles to its trial seem formidable. They include the pervasiveness of technical thought conducive to empirical-analytic research, vested interests in the empirical-analytic paradigm, ignorance of alternatives and reluctance to risk venturing into unfamiliar territory. Despite the uncertainties and obstacles, I am increasingly attracted to the possibilities of critical social inquiry. The following commentary on architects and the "art" of architecture well conveys my beliefs about educational "science" and social studies research.

> Every important architect has shown us a way to see the world that is at least a little bit different from what we have known before and has given us a sense of expanded possibility. . . . Architecture that is only

> an individual expression, that is nothing but a personal language, will probably be a private language as well, cut off from the public that all architecture has at least some responsibility to communicate with. Of course, the opposite kind of architecture, that which offers nothing but the familiar, is no more successful, for it represents no challenge to our established ways of seeing and thus one does nothing to advance the art at all. (Goldberger 1984, pp. 65–66)

Rather than simplifying the reading, using and doing of research in social studies education, I suspect that we have made matters more complex. Complexity, while not a virtue in itself, more aptly conveys the nature of the undertaking. We have not offered rules to follow. Instead, we have provided ideas, examples, and arguments that could serve as evidence, hypotheses, and frames for your own reflection and action. Having eschewed blind acceptance of conventional research practices for a broad vision of possibilities, passion and informed choice, we invite your participation in the dialogue and your contribution to social studies research.

NOTES

[1] More recently, Shaver (1982) has argued for what I call an interpretive use of research in social studies education.

REFERENCES

Borich, Gary. "Implications for Developing Teacher Competencies from Process-Product Research." *Journal of Teacher Education* 30 (January 1979): 77–86.

Buchmann, Margret. "The Use of Research Knowledge in Teacher Education and Teaching." *American Journal of Education* 92 (August 1984): 421–439.

Cornbleth, Catherine. "On the Social Study of Social Studies." *Theory and Research in Social Education* 10 (Winter 1982): 1–16.

Gergen, Kenneth J. *"Toward Transformation in Social Knowledge."* New York: Springer-Verlag, 1982.

Goldberger, Paul. "Genius or Eccentric?" *The New York Times Magazine* (April 15, 1984): 65–70.

Kaplan, Abraham. *"The Conduct of Inquiry."* New York: Chandler, 1964.

Popkewitz, Thomas S. "Whither/Wither the Curriculum Field?" *Contemporary Education Review* 1 (Spring 1982): 15–21.

Shaver, James P. "The Usefulness of Educational Research in Curricular/Instructional Decision-Making in Social Studies." *Theory and Research in Social Education* 7 (Fall 1979): 21–46.

Shaver, James P. "Reappraising the Theoretical Goals of Research in Social Education." *Theory and Research in Social Education* 9 (Winter 1982): 1–16.

INDEX

A

assumptions (also see objectives) 4, 11–14, 18–20, 24–25, 78–83, 85, 88, 97, 114, 128–130, 132, 134

B

bias 46–47, 79

C

case studies 84, 86, 89, 112, 122

Classroom Action Research Network 111–112

classroom procedures 7, 42–45, 47–49, 51, 58–66, 93–103, 111–113, 116

"climate of opinion" 11–12, 24–25

comparative studies 83

computer technology 31

content analysis 83–84, 85, 112

critical sciences 14, 19–20, 23–24, 25–26, 128, 130–131

critical studies 7, 78–89, 100, 128

E

empirical-analytic studies 12–17, 18, 21, 24, 25, 93, 97, 128–132

ethnographic studies 7, 13, 51–75, 84, 85, 86, 89, 94–95, 96, 97, 99, 117, 122, 128–129, 131, 132

experiment, definition of 41

experimental studies 7, 29, 40–50, 122, 128–129

F

Frankfurt School 80–81

funding 4, 31, 117

H

historical studies 83, 89, 122

hypotheses (also see objectives) 29–30, 43, 46, 54, 55, 85

I

interview 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 55, 57, 68–69, 83, 85, 86, 95, 99, 111, 117, 122

J

jigsaw method 7, 42–46, 49, 131, 134

L

laboratory procedures 7, 41, 45–46

literature, review of 29, 30–31, 41, 49, 85

M

Marxism, Marxist 19–20, 24, 78–81, 86, 89

N

National Academy of Education 114

National Council for the Social Studies 110, 116–117
  Research Advisory Committee 116–117

National Council of Teachers of English 117

O

objectives (also see assumptions) 29–30

objectivity 114

observation 85, 86, 95–96, 111, 122

opinion polls (also see interviews and questionnaries) 28

originality 4–5

P

paradigm 5–8, 10–26, 93, 115, 128–129, 131–132, 134–137

pilot studies 37–38

predictions (also see assumptions) 41–42, 43

Protestant commitment 21

Q

questionnaires 15, 28, 33, 34–37, 44–45, 111

quotas 31–32

R

research, definition of 1

research, passion in 1–7, 88

research, resources for (also see funding) 29, 31, 32–33

S

sampling 28, 29, 31–33, 114

sociolinguistic studies (see ethnographic studies)

sociology of knowledge 19–20, 24, 78–81, 89

statistical analyses 5, 15, 44, 87

statistical studies 13

surveys 7, 28–38, 84–85, 87, 114, 128, 129

symbolic sciences 14, 17–19, 22–26, 128, 130–131

T

textbooks 5, 84–85, 87, 88, 113, 122, 125, 131

tracking 87–88, 94
